EN

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group call on Thursday, the 29th of July at 19:00 UTC. On this call, we have Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Judith Hellerstein, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Holmquist, Sebastien Bachollet, and Aziz Hilali. We have received apologies from Satish Babu, Vanda Scartezini, Justine Chew, Dave Kissoondoyal, Joanna Kulesza, and Olivier Crepin-Leblond. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Becky Nash, Victoria Yang, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Devan Reed, on call management. We have French and Spanish interpretation on this call today. Our French interpreters are Aurélie and Jacques and our Spanish interpreters are Marina and David.

A friendly reminder to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise and to please state your name when taking the floor, each and every time, for transcription and reporting purposes. We do also have real-time transcribing on today's call. I'll put the link in the chat. Thank you all very much. And I'll turn the floor over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And thank you and good morning to the participants, including Becky. The purpose of today's call is a presentation. This is the first of two meetings with ICANN Planning. The purpose of the call, both today and in two weeks' time, really is to understand a participate in the understanding of the creation of a planning Prioritization Framework from ICANN Planning in terms of leading up to the budget.

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 if you look at the timeline that is on OFBC working page, the timeline for budgeting really actually starts end of August, early September. What we are doing is learning about the process that's being put in place by the planning team to understand the planning and the budgeting process.

What we did a fortnight—two weeks ago—was have a discussion about the priorities—the initiatives for budgeting. And those are in the document—the Finance and Operating Budget for '22 to '25. We've had a really good presentation by Becky and her team on those priorities. It's important for this group to understand and to contribute to the budgeting process and comments in light of the actual operating initiatives. So what this group has done is develop the order of priority from an ALAC perspective on the priorities for ALAC on budgeting.

We've asked that members of this group identify their priorities or, from their perception, the priorities for this group of those operating initiatives. What we've got also on our workspace now is an indication of people who are wanting to do a bit further work on each of the operating initiatives so that there is expertise in this group in the identification of the operating initiatives and the top.

We also took a poll from this group. And this poll is also … The outcomes of this poll are on our operating page. In terms of from ALAC perspective, the operating initiatives that we feel are most important from us—and they're listed—include, first of all, the strengthening of the MSM model. The first one was the MSM. Second, the community's decision-making. The third was universal acceptance. The fourth was planning and the fifth is monitoring legislation. But there are two other

items that were particularly important—the support for evolution of the root server system and the DNS ecosystem.

So those are the things that we've identified that, from our perspective, are important. It means that when we go forward with contributing to the actual budgeting process, which is soon to start, we will have an idea of what is important for ICANN. I will be asking people who have signed up against one or other of those initiatives to have a discussion in terms of why they're important for ALAC so that when we respond to the budget, we're responding not only to numbers but we're responding to what's important from the perspective of ALAC and the RALOs.

So with that, we're now going to have a rundown from Becky and her team-and thank you very much—on the project that they're developing, which is the planning Prioritization Framework, which is a key step in the annual process that we're actually coming to know and understand. With that, Becky, I'm going to let you take over with your presentation.

By the way, there will be, during the presentation, opportunities for everyone to ask questions throughout. So I'll be monitoring the chat. If you have questions, we can make a note of those and, Becky, when appropriate, you can actually ask for some feedback with you as we go. So again, thank you for your time. Over to you, Becky.

BECKY NASH: Holly, thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Becky Nash from ICANN Org planning. Before I begin, I do see that there is a hand raised in the room. Holly, should we go ahead and [inaudible]?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we should.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Becky, to see my hand and to give me the floor. Just to say—and maybe Cheryl will wish to jump in—but you have several of this working group who is working on the prioritization about all the recommendations from all the working group and reviews currently.

One of the main questions I have personally, it's how we will put also into consideration some of the major issues coming out of this group, particularly, specifically as we discuss the ATRT3 recommendations. I feel that we can't just keep with this element—not saying that there are the other elements to be taken into account for our work. I know why it is just that we discussed because it's what is under the operation for the ICANN Org for the moment. But we, as At-Large, we need to have a bigger picture. At least it's my feeling. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Sebastien. Maureen, I'm going to put you on the spot because—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got my hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: - agenda, ATRT3. Do you want us to take that task on or not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My hand is up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I wanted that question answered from Maureen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. Don't ask the ATRT3 shepherds and don't ask the chair of ATRT3. But, Maureen, have at it. And read the chat. I'll put my hand down.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen, from the chair of the ALAC, when do you see discussion taking place on the ATRT3? Because it's not on our agenda but should it be? That would be the question that I have for you. Okay, look. Sebastien, I will have a conversation with Maureen as to whether and how we fit ATRT3 into this group. We're heading now into a budgeting process and we will be focusing on how we—commenting on that. But I understand the importance of what you're talking about, particularly the holistic review, which we had discussions on, I think two meetings ago. Cheryl, do you want to comment now and then we'll get going?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly, if I may. Not going to deal with ATRT aspects at all but I did want to point out to Sebastien that this prioritization conversation, unfortunately using the words, is all about the operational initiatives of

the Strategic Plan and budgeting process—so those 15 points—and not the recommendations work that the small team is doing. I was trying to help you get that on-track for today's agenda.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Becky, was that slide delayed? Could we have the discussion for today on the planning Prioritization Framework?

BECKY NASH: Absolutely. Great. Thank you again, Holly, and thank you, everyone. I think these opening questions and discussion have been very interesting because we, as well, in the planning group, would like to clarify a few aspects of our work and ask everyone here for some input.

So with that, we're going to start and discuss what we're calling Planning Prioritization Framework. And this is one of many consultations. We have two scheduled with this group and many more to follow, in my opinion. So on the agenda, we're going to cover the introduction and objective. We're going to discuss what we're calling the Prioritization Framework design elements.

And we've broken the presentation down into two sections—consultation number, with the specific focus and dialog regarding three of the six components of the design elements, and then consultation number two, which is the balance or the remaining three. And then, we've included a short appendix as well. So this presentation, we expect, will be used for two consultations. But again, as we receive feedback from everyone here today, we want to be as effective and

efficient with everybody's time because we do know that everyone is very busy.

In this first section, I'm going to cover what we're calling the project background and project scope. I actually think this will be something that I encourage dialog with everyone as well. So please do not hesitate to raise hands, put questions in the chat. Holly has indicated that she'd like to help facilitate some of the dialog.

Some from the standpoint of ICANN Org's Planning Department, we are leading the creation of a Planning Prioritization Framework to help the ICANN ecosystem prioritize its work within the planning process in a manner that is transparent, inclusive, and efficient. And this Planning Prioritization Framework and techniques will be implemented in future annual operating and financial planning cycles to inform decision-making for the annual and the five-year planning process. The timing for an implemented framework is expected for FY24 planning and beyond.

The purpose of the project is twofold. Now, we're talking the short-term project that we are actually working on as we speak. And the objective is to design a conceptual framework with embedded techniques for making informed collective decisions on the prioritization of ICANN's project-based work. And the second purpose is to collaborate and engage with the community, Board, and Org to seek broad and diverse input on the approach to planning prioritization. This collaboration is so that we can design together, so that we can plan together in the future.

We've included a little bit of Q&A, or what is often called an FAQ, in order to try to set the stage for this. The reason I say that is we know being part of ICANN, overall, in the ecosystem, everyone has a lot to do. I can certainly appreciate that those on this call have a lot to do with their important role in the community. So we are looking at a Prioritization Framework for the annual planning process but we do know that there are cascading elements of prioritization throughout all of our processes. And we want to take a macro look at that but also start with this process related to the annual planning cycle.

So one of the first questions that we often get is, "Will Org propose a draft framework to start from during the engagement?" And we want to be very clear that, no, Org is not going to say, "Here is our suggested design. What do you think? Please help us make some adjustments. Or are we on the right track?" We are really just starting this process with a very open dialog, where we're proposing a list of components or design elements that need to be decided together with the community. And we even want to know have we missed anything in the design elements of starting this project.

So we're starting, really, with an open canvas and I just wanted to make sure that that, hopefully, is received well and is clear that we really want broad input through the engagement or consultation process. And we're taking notes, and brainstorming, and collecting ideas. And then, once all those ideas are collected and consolidated, a draft framework will then be written down, reflecting all the input received, and we will be publishing. And there will be versions of that report. So this is a very iterative process because we want to embrace this concept together and

also come out with the best output so that it could encompass many, many stages of all of our work in the ICANN ecosystem.

So our commitment is to listen, collect, write down, and receive input and be very flexible. So the proposed framework will then be shared back with the groups consulted, the entire community for further engagement, and then leading to further inputs and edits.

Another question that we got, because we are all very focused on the annual planning cycle and we've just concluded the FY22 Operating and Financial Plan cycle, and we are now launching the FY23 planning cycle. "Is the Prioritization Framework going to be implemented for the FY23 planning cycle?" which, technically, we've been working on already for a couple of months, getting ready to launch a kickoff.

And the answer is no. The project to design the Planning Prioritization Framework is beginning during this time, which is also the time when we're doing the FY23 planning process. And a pilot is suggested on one activity in all of the activities that ICANN includes in the annual Operating Plans but it's not a fully-implemented process for FY23 planning because we would be very late at this moment. But we're doing all of this discussion and consultation so that we can include elements of this before and during the public comment process for comment and feedback. But there's going to be a lot of time to continue to iterate on this.

We are hoping that, through the public comment period, having this process laid out with the input that we will have received by then will also help us get to the point where we'll receive some comments on it

as a resource or an attachment to the main focus of the public comment for the Draft Operating Plan. And that way, then we can get right into real details following the public comment period and really line up for an expected FY23 planning process implementation.

Okay. One thing we'd like to highlight … And this is really for input. If we look at this as a component in the annual planning cycle, we are suggesting that there is a step for planning prioritization for all of the major work or activities in scope for this project. That is going to be part of our discussion today, that we would suggest a planning prioritization step happen in the May and June timeframe of the planning cycle. And if we just spend a minute on this slide—because, again, I know there are several people that have participated in our process in detail—our collective process. But in case there are some that have not, I'd just like to spend a little bit of time.

The planning process constitutes the strategic planning, operating planning, and the budgeting. And the process really starts in the January through March, with the strategic outlook trends identification step. That's in a calendar year. Then it moves into this trends analysis and impact. That entire first two bubbles is really related to identifying has there been any major strategic shift in ICANN's work that would require an evaluation of the strategic plan?

After that, we're suggesting that as we move into the project kickoff of the operating planning process, which results in July through December, which a draft is published for a Five-Year Operating and Financial Plan and a One-Year Operating Plan and Budget, that we take time out in the May and June timeframe to collaborate on an inventory or a listing of

major activities, and work out a prioritization, and hear input from all of the SOs and ACs and all of the community at that time, so that then that could be received as input into Org's development of detailed operating plans.

And then, we move through the processes that we do of developing the plans, publishing the drafts for public comment, and then after the public comment period, we receive comments and provide a staff report. The plans are then revised, if there are elements that are to be revised, and then they're submitted or proposed for adoption to the ICANN Board. And then, there is the subsequent empowered community period.

So again, in the context of the consultation today, the process that we're looking to design is having a step up front, from the development in the operating plans, where we have a framework where we collectively identify what's the priority.

Okay. So now I'm just going to continue to move one. There'll be plenty of opportunities to look at detailed slides on this as part of our consultation. But that sets the stage of what we're talking about at the concept of a planning step.

So the elements that we have put out as the basic design elements needed to design a step in the annual planning process are as follows. The scope of the work needs to be agreed upon. The participants in the process, in their roles and responsibilities, need to be consulted upon and agreed. And the frequency. We have slides just related to all of those elements.

And then the next three ones, again, we've suggested that we don't think we'll get to those today. But in the second session, we'll be able to then talk about actual agreed-upon prioritization techniques or models and then systems, tools, and reports, and reporting out and publishing the projects that are underway in prioritization. And then, we would like to talk about a pilot and get feedback on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Becky, may I interrupt here?

BECKY NASH: Please. Any time.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd just like to point out that what we're doing in tandem, which I mentioned at the very beginning, is identification from the ALAC and APRALO point of view and using the operating initiatives to help us determine for ourselves the prioritization. Is that how you see what we're doing with the operating initiatives as helping for us to develop a sense of prioritization in budgets?

BECKY NASH: From my standpoint, I think the ranking of the work that's included in the Operating Plans and identifying what is important to a particular community is very useful. I think this helps the working group that also works on the public comments gain a deeper understanding of what is included in the operating plans so that they can then provide comments

on what it means for ICANN as a whole and then ALAC. So I do think that that is very, very helpful. I think when we get to the scope, which is the first design element, we can also have a little bit of precision here about what we're calling the work to prioritize, if that makes sense.

HOLLY RAICHE: That does and that's very helpful. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Holly, thank you so much. Again, we're so pleased to be here. And we learn a lot when we have this dialog. That's what's also really, really helpful. So with that, I'm going to move into the actual consultation slides. Again, from our standpoint, I'm here with my colleague, Victoria Yang, who's also part of the planning department at ICANN Org. And we are here to answer any questions that anyone may have.

When we talk about a planning prioritization step, that is the first step before the Operating Plan. So again, that's something that we're going to talk in-depth about. We have identified three components of work to have as in-scope. I just want to run through this and get some feedback on it.

One is Org implementation work. That would be implementation of review recommendations, policy development proposals, other implementation from CCWG. These are usually multiyear projects as activities. And of course, some examples that we're all familiar with would be ATRT3 recommendation implementation and then Work Stream 2 recommendation implementation.

The second component is Org-initiated work—so work that triggers activities for other community members, Org, and Board. This is where we're indicating that there are areas of work within ICANN Org where there are technical papers that are published. We seek broad input in consultations on that and we know that that means that there's work for the community members to do. And how you organize your work, that's also very important. So it's really where we have initiated work that the community is required to pay attention to, and provide feedback, and participate in.

Some of those examples would the be ITI project. I know that that's been something that the community members have been quite active in. We seek consultation. We want to make sure that the new ITI meets the needs of everybody. Another instance would be the name service portal for NSP and compliance systems, meaning in the Contracted Parties space, there have been projects over the years to ensure that the interaction is captured in a robust system and can be tracked.

And then we do identify an area, which is community-initiated work, where there's work triggered for community members, Org, and Board, from one area to another area to ensure that you review, and provide feedback, and participate. So that would be policy development, where it's important, as part of the multistakeholder model that there is all of this feedback. And I know there's a lot going on in the ICANN ecosystem right now. So keeping track of where to provide feedback and how, I think, is a tall task for all the groups.

One of the things that we want to stress at the bottom of this slide, and that we hope, over time, we can make the operating plans a lot clearer,

that we're not suggesting that there is a prioritization of ongoing Org operations and support. That means in our operating plan, where we have elements of what we call the functional activities, where we're not really going to rank or prioritize those activities, some of them are required for the corporation or organization.

We need a human resources department. If you have employees, there's certain laws and geographical needs to have actual human resources. We need to have a billing department in order to bill the Contracted Parties under the contracts and receive the funding that then is received by ICANN Org for the good of the organization. So we're making that distinction that ongoing operations is not something that we would put in a Prioritization Framework. It's actually these larger, mostly multiyear projects.

Then also, small organizational projects that are under a functional activity really would not meet the threshold to be prioritized during this annual planning process. So that might be, maybe, some maintenance or a small change to the billing system, again coming from my planning and finance area, or a small tweak to make the statements look better, we're not going to say, "Oh. This should be on this list of projects for this large collaborative prioritization" because that just wouldn't be effective for everybody's time. Of course, that doesn't mean that as we communicate upon it or we're sharing information, that we don't receive feedback. But it's not something that would be part of what's called a planning prioritization.

I'm going to stop here and see if there's anything … What we do at the end of this is … Sorry. Within the consultations, we stop and have a

page just to say, "Oh. Are there any initial reactions?" So I usually toggle back to the actual scope and just see. Does this seem to make sense for what we're calling the planning prioritization? Is there anything on this list that you want further clarification or you don't think it makes sense to discuss having that in the scope of activities?

HOLLY RAICHE: There's a comment from Marita. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Is it on now?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Becky. This is great. It's super interesting how you're trying to organize this huge moving mass of things. And I really hope that we can get our heads around figuring out just how the things that we do and the operating initiatives are fitting into this. Maybe I'm asking this question in advance of when it's going to be answered. But I'm just thinking of an operating initiative—for example, that one about the ethics. What is that? The third of fourth one. Would that fit into here somehow? Is that community-initiated work? Some of things are … They're all coming from various parts, right? So maybe that's not a question that fits into here but you can just tell me if not.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Marita, for your question. I do believe this is exactly what fits in here, meaning within the Operating Plan, which part of the work included there would be included in a prioritization? And at initial thoughts, because the operating initiatives are areas of work within the operating plan that support the achievement of the Strategic Plan, meaning that's why they're called out is that they are strategic and they're not ongoing operations, per se. But they would be something that would be included in prioritization.

Then we would look at the requirements of those projects, meaning are they multiyear? And the answer would be yes. I think that's a very good way to go. I think what we want to try to do together with the community is receive feedback on how to better articulate, within the Operating Plans, work that is strategic to support ICANN's strategic plan versus ongoing continuing operations. And as that distinction, hopefully we're able to move towards that over several years. We'll be able to then say what is very strategic, that we then want to put into, say, a prioritization model or framework so that we talk about it up front before developing the ICANN Draft Operating Plan.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks, Becky. Could I loop back to Sebastien's question as to where the recommendations for the ATRT3 fit? I would draw Sebastien's attention to number one, the implementation of work. It's under that heading the implementation of things like the ATRT3 and Work Stream 2 fit. So do you want to just talk again, just a sentence or two about one so that will

explain where that fits in the process and that will clarify when we actually think about the recommendations in ATRT3, and in particular, ones that interest this group. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:
Yes. Thank you very much, Holly, for your question. As part of the FY22 Operating Plan, we have indicated in the plan that the Work Stream 2 recommendations have been prioritized for implementation. That work has been ongoing. Hopefully everyone has been able to participate to the webinar as it relates to work related to Work Stream 2. We've included in the Operating Plan an appendix—a listing about the status of other community review recommendations. And we have indicated that only Board-approved or after-Board-consideration recommendations could move to implementation but that they have to be prioritized.

That is why we're discussing right now this Prioritization Framework so that we can then review all of the activities that are on the list to be completed and discuss prioritization together with the community so that we can start to move the recommendations that are there, already approved, into what's called implementation design phase, which is a timing of work before full-blown implementation. Those are exactly the types of projects that are included in the Prioritization Framework.

HOLLY RAICHE:
Are there any other questions? If not, we can move on. Thank you. I don't see any other hands.

BECKY NASH: Okay.

VICTORIA YANG: May I make a comment here? The operating initiatives, in our opinion, are the work that we identified to support the deliverable of the Five-Year Strategic Plan. So in other words, the Org is going to work on delivering the operating initiatives so they are sort of prioritized.

The scope here we want to discuss is by looking at the three types of scope—the first one, Org implementation work. This is where the scope covers the review recommendations. cross-community working group recommendations, as well as policy recommendations. In our current Operating Plan, Appendix B, you can see that we have more than 200 recommendations. So how do we prioritize that? That was one of the questions, whether or not we should have that in the prioritization scope.

The second one is Org-initiated, as we gave the examples here, like ITI and some IT systems, to make work more efficient and effective. Then the last one is really the ongoing community work, like ALAC, GAC, and RSSAC will be providing advice. So we have advice registry. GNSO Council will have all the PDPs. Currently, we have certain number of PDPs. In the future, if we have more or so, should this be in the prioritization scope? When we do the annual planning process, should we prioritize that as well?

So these are basically the three scopes. And we could be choosing one, or a combination of more people, or all. But this is something that we

want to consult with all the ACs and SOs and help us to make a decision. What makes sense?

HOLLY RAICHE: Victoria, could you comment on Marita's comment in the chat, where she says, "So the current operating initiatives are already prioritized?

VICTORIA YANG: For the Five-Year because if we look at the Operating Plan, there are five-year operating initiatives. Sorry. They are designed to lay out the work that—mapped out, basically, for five years. So you can see some of them have more specifics, like, "We will deliver this in Fiscal Year 21, deliver that in Fiscal Year 22, deliver that in Fiscal Year 23." Some of them will take five years. Some of them may finish in three years. So they are a phased work for the Five-Year because the way that they were initially developed is to deliver the major work to deliver the Five-Year Strategic Plan. So they won't be finished in one year but mapped out in five years—phased out in five years.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thanks. Marita, does that help?

VICTORIA YANG: Sorry. Just one more sentence. Whereas this Prioritization Framework, as Becky introduced in the introduction part, is more for the annual—like for the upcoming cycle, how do we prioritize all this work that is in the pipeline?

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Marita, is that clear?

MARITA MOLL: Well, it was for a minute there until Victoria muddied it up for me again. Sorry. So currently, what's in the Five-Year Plan is in the Five-Year Plan. So what you're talking about here is what might be added to the Five-Year Plan and also starting to plan the next five years? Is that encompassing it a bit?

VICTORIA YANG: Go ahead, Becky.

BECKY NASH: I was just going to say that each plan lays out, over the five years … And again, our plans include two major big areas, which is work to support the strategic plan and then ongoing operations. And each fiscal year, when we do a One-Year Operating Plan and Budget, because the elements of the work that may have been laid out in the Five-Year Plan change, so the schedule changes, that's why each year, new work can come in if other work is delayed, if you know what I mean, because of the fact that we have an annual envelope of funding available. So within each year, there's a prioritization of what the detailed plans—of what should be greenlighted to go forward because something else may have moved out, which is what you see over the five-year horizon.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

VICTORIA YANG: May I add? For instance, if we picture Fiscal Year 23, which we are already in the cycle now and this prioritization work will be evolved and refined … Let's say for Fiscal Year 24. And if we have, based on the scope here, just as an example—and don't call me on that—let's say we use one as an example. We already defined the scope to prioritize should stay with just number one. We should only focus on all the implementation work. Then we should be looking at a list—like an inventory list—laying out all the recommendations from the specific reviews, and all the recommendations from policy, and perhaps even advice. So we have all that as the inventory list.

And throwing out a number, let's say we have 300 or 250. For Fiscal Year 24, during that planning cycle, how are we going to prioritize among these 200 in '24. We know we can't do all 200 in '24. So are we going to prioritize these 30, versus the other 30, versus the other 50? But first we need to define what goes on that inventory list? Is it just one, or all three, or a combination of a couple here? I hope that helps. If not, please feel free to ask follow-up questions. And I see Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Victoria. It's more a question for Becky, what she wrote in the chat. Maybe that's my understanding of English but the problem here, I see that if we came after the introduction of the operating initiatives for five years, we are outside of the scope of five years. And the question of when it's come and when it's introduced, it's for me a

problem because I see, or I consider, that some of the recommendations from outside those lists for the operating initiatives could be or need to be included into this list today, even if it was not ready when you started to work.

The question is how do we deal with this environment where things are evolving, both from the work done by the community, by Org, and by the Board, and by the outside of ICANN. Because if you say that the initiatives are included for five years and we are done. And once again, maybe it's my understanding.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Sebastien. I just want to clarify that the planning process includes the operating plans for five years and a one-year. The Five-Year—and this is just more in general, in planning—operating plans and budgets, they are estimates over the horizon of the time, meaning it's a plan. So then, other either more urgent work or work that was not foreseen may arrive into our activities, meaning collectively—the community, Board, and the Org—and then there may be a Board decision to move forward with that.

So I just wanted to explain that a plan is an estimate and it's laid out so that we can work efficiently together to achieve the objectives. Specifically, the objectives would be achieving the strategic plan objectives, goals, and targeted outcomes along with achieving the work that is required, meaning required to run the organization or by law.

So there is always … With this horizon of five years, the goal is to complete that work to support the Five-Year Strategic Plan. Then, the

scheduling of it will come in as ebbs and flows, meaning there will be times where things either move in or move out. And I think that's where we're suggesting this annual prioritization. Then we will start to be able to agree together what goes into the one-year, more detailed operating plan each year.

So I'm just going to pause and ask Sebastien. Did I answer your question correctly or is there some precision about my statement, where I think how we've been describing this is that the prioritization is more of a one-year immediate. Like before each planning cycle, "Okay. What have we all agreed upon is already underway and moving along?" and then, "What more do we want to put in there?"

And I will just end with one caveat, which again, we're here to help explain this but everything is subject to the funding available—so the amount of funding that comes into ICANN. And recently, because of the impact of the global pandemic for our organization—community, Board, and Org—where we actually did not travel and have in-person ICANN meetings, there is this new concept of funding for multiyear projects, which we call the SFICR. That was another presentation and webinar earlier in the year. So also, there's contingency. So when something is decided to move forward, the funding associated with it is going to be laid out or scheduled out as well.

So I'll just pause there and ask if, Sebastien, would you like to just confirm if we're answering the question correctly or if there's more observations to be made there.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think you answered the question. But I still feel that I have trouble to understand. [I pushed the button], in fact. Just take any important event. New gTLD round, if it's happened, the decision is taken the first of July. Therefore, we have already done the budgeting. We have already done the one-year planning. We have already done the five-year planning and so on. It's just to take an example. It's not to say that it will happen. But how at the first of July, the Board decides that they need to change all the budget, all the Five-Year Strategic Plan, all the One-Year Operation Plan, and so on and so forth.

It's just to take one example. I could have taken that in September, the NTIA decides that the IANA transition can start and therefore it was not budgeted, or some of the recommendation from some review, or it could be on that list. It's not to say that I know how it is budgeted. But how do we [answer] those types of things what can happen in the middle of the planning process, when we have already done all the work. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Yes. Thank you, Sebastien. This is definitely a very good conversation to have about what does the plan represent. And it is cascading from the Board-adopted Strategic Plan and then into the Five-Year Operating Plan and then the One-Year Operating Plan and Budget. We all know that we … Maybe just stepped back in a personal capacity, I may set out a schedule to buy a house or something like that but then something might change and I have to adapt. That's part of the governance of it.

And in our operating and planning process … And you used a good example. Maybe the new gTLD next round. Or may people, in another discussion, used the GDPR initiatives. None of us had mentioned, actually, the transition because that would have been something really hard to plan for in a prioritization process. I'm so thankful that that took place and was very successful, although we have Work Stream 2 recommendations still be implemented.

But Victoria added in the chat that there is this concept of the contingency fund that's included in each annual budget, exactly for work that was unanticipated and is approved, meaning required to do, for either maybe a legal reason or from the direction of the Org, Board, and Community, or specifically, the Board. So as an organization, just like many organizations, we lay out a plan. We try to march towards that plan. But then, there may be things that come in. The key is how are they funded?

So in some organizations, unfortunately, you would make the trade-off during that year, like, "I was going to have HR. Now I can't have HR and I have to do something else," but that's a very drastic decision. Luckily the support of the community, the ICANN Board has been able to have what we call the contingency amount in the budget each year in order to use them for unanticipated expenses.

Then the second thing that I'll say is for ongoing operations expenses, we also now have the SFICR, which I have to pull up—the Supplemental Fund for Implementation of Community Recommendations. That's a mechanism where because we had excess in prior years, we now have

the ability to assign, through proper approval, to new initiatives so that we can start to accomplish things that need to be in operations.

And then the final thing I'll say before I stop here is just as Victoria said, there are two big elements in our Five-Year Operating Plan that are considered self-funded and one is the next round of new gTLDs, which has an operating initiative. But it actually will receive the funding separately and is accounted for separately as part of what required from the CCWG and the working group about that. And then, there's the auction proceeds eventual setup and mechanism there, that is also considered self-funded and not an ICANN operation. I'll just pause there. Sebastien, your hand is up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I ask that we just move on? Because you've got a few more slides and I'd like you to get through them. Sebastien, let's just see if we can get through more slides and have your question answered, if we've got time, at the end. Sebastien, Becky's going to be back in the next fortnight as well. So this is just the first half. But I'd like to at least finish these slides in the next half hour, which is what we've got. Okay?

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Holly. Yes. We will have many opportunities to address all the questions. But with that, I will move forward. But definitely, Sebastien will have opportunities to talk about this as well.

The next one is actually another design element. Again, I meant to pause and say as we go through these, if there's other elements, either

in this session or future sessions, that you think we need to put on our list of really fleshing out, other than the ones that we've listed, we could tell you which ones keep us up at night.

The next one is actually the participants to the prioritization process. So how are the participants identified? What are their role and responsibilities in the process? And as in the opening, I do want to talk a little bit about roles and responsibilities overall in planning and refer the group … I don't have the page number at my fingertips but I will make a list of the fact that in the Five-Year Operating plan there is actually, in the introduction, a very good description of the roles and responsibilities in planning. And that is definitely something that we use to leverage how we all work together, meaning what does Org do? What does the community do? And then what are the role of the Board?

So roles and responsibilities of participants. Again, today we're consulting, as part of the project, to brainstorm or seek feedback. Then, we're going to take that feedback and propose a designed process. So when we say here that as part of that annual process, the ICANN Planning Team will facilitate Prioritization Framework discussions with participants each year during May and June timeframe … Frequency is another one of our elements we'll talk about in a minute. But that's what we're suggesting, at a minimum, as input into the drafting of the annual Operating Plan.

And the participants will use tools and techniques, to be determined, as part of this project, to provide recommendations of what the priorities should be. The ICANN Planning Team will share the outcome of that prioritization step, which is going to be an inserted new step in the

annual planning cycle. And we will share the output of it for further input opportunity.

So one key there is we're asking that this annual step have a process that we can then collect it. And then, we're going to give the input to ICANN Org planning liaison as they develop their Operating Plan. And then, we will be reporting back out on how those listed priorities were then reflected in the plan and all of that will go out for public comment. So should there be a time where there is a choice made or a trade-off, it will be, again, subject to public comment.

So when we have this step in the annual planning process, basically, what's the structure of the participation of it? So consultations by SOs and ACs and then community public webinars because of the fact that we want to make sure that our planning process is diverse, inputs, transparent, open, and everybody is free to participate.

Another structure is form a group and committee. That's a more formalized structure and definitely similar to the ATRT3 review Recommendation 5. And we do have the text of that in the appendix. Or another suggestion would be should we run a separate public comment on prioritization of activities prior to the development of the Operating Plans. So if we think back to the end-to-end strategic and operating planning process, that means running a separate public comment. So I'm just going to pause here and see if there are any questions about this and also comments about it.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think, at this stage, Becky, people are still thinking about it. But these slides will be available or are available on the working group page. And it's probably an action item for people to review the slides and look at every step where there have been questions, and even though there aren't questions now, to come back with any questions for the next session. So I'd suggest keeping moving on because … Oh. Wait a minute. You've got two hands here. Okay, Marita. Go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Just for clarification, Becky, are you asking us now whether or not both step two and three should happen or is this a question for future times?

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Marita. Yes. We are asking in these consultations what seems to be pros and cons of either of these, or all of these, or a combination of these. So again, we're designing a process and there will be a written framework. But we're collecting ideas of what different community members and groups think of …

And I'll just give an example. We've listed three suggested ways to go about this with the participants and we had received some input from another group, saying, "Oh. Another public comment? That's absolutely off the table. Too many public comments. Don't have enough time for it." So we're asking for initial feedback because there'll be opportunities to comment on it in more detail. But this is where we're looking at some direction of what we think together so that when we actually detail out a process and have it all written down, we've taken this all into consideration.

MARITA MOLL: Just a quick follow-up. So I guess this could be an action item for our group to talk about this and decide which ones we would come down on.

BECKY NASH: Great idea. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Marita. And, Heidi, could you note that, please? Thank you. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Just to be sure. When you talk about two items, one, two, three and one, two, three, is there a need to choose one or it could be all three in both of these arenas? Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Yes. It could be in combination. That's something, I guess, then to say how does that sounds? We look at a proposed structure, meaning the structure or framework for participants and how they interact. It could be consultations and then community public webinars, which would be global and regional to seek diverse input. And then the information is summarized and laid out for ICANN Org to then republish what was discussed.

Or form a committee. Again, we're referencing the ATRT3 review Recommendation number five, which I know you know. But just to go on record here, saying that that review recommendation is specifically related to prioritizing community review recommendations, where we're at the planning process overall, where there's tradeoffs of overall ICANN's plans and choices to be made, of which one element is definitely the review recommendations. So we would view that any prioritization framework can happen at a function level, at the review recommendation level, then it can happen at over ICANN plans level as well.

Very good point. It could be a combination. But what do you think, or anyone, about a separate public comment process, again understanding that the entire again understanding that the entire draft plans do go out for public comment? And we know how much content is in there and the amount of effort for commenting via public comment on that. I'd love to hear input on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we'll keep going but it's something that we can actually take offline and have an offline discussion to come back to you with that one. So we can continue now but we've noted and put in the chat that this will be an action item on all of us.

BECKY NASH: Great. And I can hear, Holly, that given the timing … Obviously, we know this takes a while. That's why you were very kind to grant us two sessions. We also had contemplated doing brainstorming with Jamboard

but we know that this is such an in-depth conversation that it might be hard to do at this stage. Maybe later.

So right now, what I'm hearing is that we should move through the materials. And then, when we get together at the next presentation, we can maybe go through a list of questions or we could have three consultations—however you choose to do it, Holly. Okay. So again, the questions that we've asked, you will contemplate and provide us some feedback. So this is great. Thank you.

Okay. So the last element of the three that we have done in chapter one is the frequency. So we've had a little bit of discussion about this up front because we added the one slide with the entire process. So from ICANN Org Planning—again, we're the department that is responsible for facilitating strategic planning in all elements of operating and financial planning to collaborate with the community on—we're saying, at a minimum, it should take place once a year as part of the annual planning process.

And we're suggesting that the timing Prioritization Framework step in the annual operating planning process is May and June. We've listed May and June. We're not trying to add more work to everybody's plate. But as we finish off the prior year's cycle where, for instance, this year the FY22 plans were adopted by the ICANN Board in early May, which means they were then published to the public in late April. They were discussed and reviewed with the Board Finance Committee—the Committee that the Board of ICANN has delegated the recommendation to the Board to.

So we're ready to then start the planning for the next cycle with this step. We also thought that having consultations during the May and June may fit well with the community groups because of the June ICANN meeting. We know there's never a good time to add more meetings but we do believe that once a year, in that May-June timeframe, would give planning and then Org responsible planning liaisons and executives time to receive the input and develop operating plans in detail. So that is our recommendation.

And we're committing, which is also covered as part of the reporting and systems and tools, that we would have this prioritization step and then we would report back out on what projects—who said what and what was received as input, as the highest priority, for instance. That we, we communicate. So we're committed to having this be a step that is fully inclusive of a feedback loop, if that makes sense.

So I will pause here, just in general, any feedback. Should this be done more than once a year? Really, that's the question. Would anyone here consider that it should be done quarterly, every six months, that type of thing?

VICTORIA YANG: We have two hands. There's Sebastien, followed by Marita. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. I think it would be really disruptive to do this four times a year. Currently, there's already some stuff going on in May and June—what's it called again—that forward-looking exercise that's going on? This could

be another part of it. So if everyone gets used to the fact that this happens in May and June and we could … Yeah. I would suggest that it should be May and June and once a year.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for the feedback. I do see another hand. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you very much. I will take a few elements of what you said. I think the proposal is great but I consider it why, I guess, we in the ATRT3 pushed to have a committee to take care of that because we can have this committee convene if needed for a specific reason. Once again, I take the example of the IANA Stewardship Transition, when it happened, how we prioritized that. Yes. Everybody decided that it was the only and first thing we needed to do. But if it's something a little less obvious, it is good to be able to do it outside of May and June timeframe.

It's why if we have a group, it can be gathered easily. It could be done, if needed, in another time period but not each year, and not scheduled, and not known in advance because it will depend on what's happened within or outside of ICANN. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Sebastien. Marita, I see your hand up again and then I want to read some of the comments in the chat as well.

MARITA MOLL: No. Sorry. That's an old hand.

BECKY NASH: That's our new lingo, "old hand." Thank you for the feedback. I just wanted to read a couple comments here that I didn't see. But Sebastien, earlier you did indicate that for the first iteration, a separate public comment process would be useful, meaning it's something new and that a public comment would be useful. So we will make note of that input. I'm not sure if anyone else has a comment to say on top of that. Marita, I see your hand is up.

MARITA MOLL: All right. I was doing something in chat and couldn't find the "take the hand down." But now I want to say something in response to Sebastien's note. If there's going to be a committee and we're going to put people on that committee, I think, to a certain extent, we need to trust the people on the committee to do that work. So always having to have an open public comment every time you want to do something really puts a huge load on all of us. So I would really want to do something that's a little less onerous if we can.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your feedback there. Just in summary, the process that is agreed upon shouldn't have a public comment each year. And again, of course, once the operating plans are drafted—the plans, which include the work being planned for the year, thus prioritized, we'll be calling it out. We'll go back out for public comment as part of the standard public

comment process that's required as part of the consultations before Board consideration. So that's very helpful.

We did receive a comment from Ricardo, just that "Frequency looks okay. But I guess this time of fluent and constant conversation will also be added." I don't know exactly. Are you meaning that once we actually hold that, we'll have that list available to be discussed throughout the year? I see your hand's up. Go ahead, please, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Can you hear me?

BECKY NASH: Yes. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Becky. Sorry for the typo. It was this kind of conversation—this type of conversation, like the one we are having right now. I guess the Planning Team will be … Not just time because you are beginning, but also in the next years you're going to be having this kind of conversation in the following years with group and in ALAC, but also with the ccNSO group, GNSO group, that works with planning.

So I understand that May and June will be the timing for this planning to be done in order to do that complete process for ICANN. But also, you will keep having these kind of conversations through the years so you will have feedback if anything happens. Or if you need a formal

consultation or an informal consultation, you will have us available to do that.

BECKY NASH: Yes. Thank you. Absolutely one area that we want to make sure that we're always available to engage with groups on planning. And we often work with our colleagues in finance as well. So it's operating and financial planning and we're really happy to be here today and would love to continue being able to engage. So thank you. That is definitely a good point, that we would get feedback throughout the year. Sebastien, I see that your hand is up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please. Just very short. I heard you talking about ATRT3 recommendation and I just got back to the document. The document you are talking about, it's prioritization and rationalization of activities, policy, and recommendations. It's not just recommendations. What we have worked on was to talk about the prioritization and rationalization of all the work done within ICANN. I hope that it's not a mistake from my point of view. But that's the title. I will paste the title of this recommendation into the chat so that you have the information. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much Sebastien. So we're making note of that. I will definitely double check the language that we put in the appendix. So that is something that we will take as feedback. Thank you. I am just

going to do a time check. I think I have about five minutes left. Is that correct, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. I'm connected again. Thank you very much. Not sure why the computer does that to me but it does. And I have been following so thank you. Now, are we close to finished because I'd like to thank you. Are we up to the final slide? I don't think so.

BECKY NASH: Yes. We are.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh. We are?

BECKY NASH: Yeah. The only thing that I will just make quick mention of is we will review all of the chat. Of course, if there's anyone that had a comment there that we didn't read out, we're taking it under advisement. And then, latter in the presentation—I'll just scroll there quickly—is that we just have the overall roadmap and suggested consultations. That is where just stressing that we will be scheduling public webinars, regional webinars.

And then we've reached out to the SO and AC leadership as well, just to confirm which other groups that we can consult with as well. Again, our objective is to collect diverse stakeholder input to inform the iterations

of this draft Planning Prioritization Framework. And I can leave it at that, then.

HOLLY RAICHE: This has been a very good discussion. We didn't get as far as I had hoped we had. But there have been some really good discussions on the way which have been useful to clarify with people's minds the process. And I'm glad you've put at the very end that side on the timelines because that adds to what's on our website already, which is a good timeline. So within a fortnight, will you be ready to finish these slides and we can have our final session on the plan prioritization process, which is great?

BECKY NASH: Yeah. I'll just coordinate with Heidi and the staff quickly, just to make sure I know exactly which day this is that we're talking about. So thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I believe it's … Wait a minute. In US time, it would be Thursday the 12th of August. My time, it's the 13th of August, probably same time. Heidi, could I ask that this presentation be—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That will clash.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh. Okay. All right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I gauged it with staff and we had a lot of people who can't make it at exactly this time—Vanda, Dave, [Charity], etc. But it's easy for staff to find a best fit.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Okay. If staff could check, first of all, with Becky to see what time suits you and then what time. I would also like the presentation to be put on the site. We are going to have a further consultation on the process, as we discussed in the chat, and be seeking comments. So Heidi, as an action item that was in the chat, that would be very useful and we will talk again.

And a final reminder, people. We are looking at operating initiatives. As we've discussed in today's meeting and just a reminder, they are already part of the Five-Year Plan. But if we are going to be commenting meaningfully on the budget which is coming up, as the timeline shows, then it should be done in the knowledge of what the operating initiatives mean in the context of ALAC of APRALO.

So for those people who have not indicated which operating initiatives they are interested in following up on, may I remind you to let Heidi know and then your name will be put on the chart that is, again, on the website, which would be very useful.

So with that, are there any final comments before, Becky, I say thank you very much for the preparation and for the discussion that we've had today? It was very useful. And are there any other final questions before

I say this has been a very useful discussion, and I thank you for your tie, and I thank everybody else for your time? No further comments that I see.

Look, for the action items that are there, there will be an e-mail circulating to ask for your input. Please, there'll be Google Doc that's done. And staff will find an appropriate time for the next meeting but sometime in the next fortnight would be very useful. And again, please put this presentation up so that we can all look at the final slides we didn't have a chance to discuss. And we'll talk again in approximately two weeks. Thank you, Becky, and thank you, everyone. And with that, this meeting is adjourned.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

DEVAN REED: Thank you, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]