

a). Was the onboarding session (meeting #1) helpful?

onboarding was helpful as a recap for some of us and intro for others, BUT in years where a longer list of issues need deciding upon I would run it as a 0 day meeting

Yes

yes, very helpful

Yes very clear. As a participant in the previous pilot there was a lot of duplication, but I appreciate that not everyone had participated in the pilot.

The onboarding was thorough - perhaps too much so to where it took more time to review than the work itself

Yes, for those who participates for the first time or if there are changes vs previous approach

Assuming the participants will not be the same everytime we prioritize onboarding is essential

Perhaps a single 'orientation' for new participants that others could skip if already present?

Agree that on-boarding was very helpful, but perhaps maybe a bit too thorough in the first meeting. The relevant reading materials were sufficient

b). How would you rate the materials sent out, the review of the Planning Prioritization framework

well drafted and informed materials

Useful

very good

Fate of lower priority recs is still unclear

Good, but onboarding could have been enhanced by further materials being provided in advance (eg relevant reports) on the recommendations being prioritized

Materials are very helpful. And having them in advance of the first call (as we did) is essential

All of the materials have been very clear and indicate forethought and SME

c). What feedback do you have on the Group Operating Procedures? Specifically the role of the PPG Member and Secondary Member?

It would be great to have 2 members with equal speaking rights as opposed to a primary member and a secondary member

I'm fine with the concept

Primary / Secondary seems to work differently here than Member/Alternate throughout rest of ICANN community SG/WG

Many groups have pri / sec representing two significant groups within their 'bucket' that would be better split as primary representation, ie BC/IPC, Registry/Registrar etc

I think there was an inconsistency of treatment. We should have clarity on whether it is two participants or whether the alternate should only engage if the primary isn't there

Agree with the 2 Member comment BIT also ok if each team only ever casts 1 vote/action

Perhaps more clarity on the 'seconds' role from the beginning

It would be great to have 2 members with equal speaking rights as opposed to a primary member and a secondary member

d). What feedback or recommendations do you have for this process?

4-quad might be too simplistic. Some prioritization has dependencies.

While 4 quad works, each cycle we have noted resourcing as a point hard to disassociate from - still needs addressing and could mean a post-PC reconnection to review

More time ahead of the prioritisation meeting to update our respective groups that are not part of the planning and prioritization group and ask for any views

I'd suggest to have feedback session like this after every prioritization exercise

since we had few recommendations it was fine, but if there were more, then greater time to gather feedback from our groups would help

e). Regarding Prioritization techniques, was ICANN's org pre score helpful as a starting point for community discussion?

Yes

Prescoring was well-formed

Pre-scoring is useful as it drives focus and provides a useful jumping off point

some potential bias in the pre score, however, it gave a starting point to focus with

Yes

I feel that the pre-score biases our view on the topic.

yes. the prescore may have influenced the route we took, not so much the final destination/result.

Yes

YES

Yes

f). Any other feedback for future improvement of this process?

Scoring could have benefitted from decimal values to help more granularly identify tiebreaker situations

At least 1 week's advance notice of meeting times

setting call times further in advance. if it gets to late in week one and some of the potential Doodle options are on the following Monday and the poll is not yet closed thats a proble

Set meeting dates and times before the process kicks off is desirable

a). Scope of activity eligible for Prioritization: The scope of activity to be prioritized are activities approved by the Board, such as Review Recommendation, PDP Recommendation, CCWG Recommendation and Advice.

Fate of lower priority recs is still unclear (frame1)

The scope of activities eligible for prioritization could include decisions coming up for the Board, not just approved actions

(2)...that doesn't reflect the fact that there are matters currently before the board, they will (should) be approved and should fall into the FY24 planning cycle....

(1) we discussed on call one and I understand Org's point that until the board approve something it is not ready to be prioritised BUT...

Lower priority items potentially staying low priority for long periods despite approval

Further to the fate of say a P4 in any given cycle, is also what may happen to ANY P value but P3/4 certainly when subsequent years rounds are added to the programming

(3)...Leaving them out is unsatisfactory. Surely there is a way to prioritise on the conditional basis. If the board doesn't approve they don't go forward.

until it's not approved by Board it cannot be prioritized, if not prioritized it is not included in next year plan. It may result in 2-year delay with implementation

b). Frequency: The planning prioritization process takes place once a year during the annual Operating Plan and Budget process. Please comment on the group discussion and standing check in mid year and/or on an add needed basis

Fully support a standing 'check-in'

Standing check in does seem to be in order considering the scale of the annualized timeframe

The current frequency is sufficient and it's likely unnecessary to have a standing check in mid year (though perhaps an ad hoc meeting could be called if needed)

2 times per year. maybe quarterly - depends on when activities to prioritise appear

Cadence was good - it is likely that, once implementation of the p/p gets under way, some elements from prior p/p (especially lower ranked ones) need reconsideration against new batch

Time in queue should be factored where reconsidering legacy P/P scores that are being re-eval'd

What happens if a low priority P4 evolves in such a way that it should be re-prioritized into a P1- to take an extreme

The default should be once a year but if there are a number of approved items from the Board then an additional prioritization process could be called

Due to the evolutionary work, sometimes priorities need updating. Might quarterly review and re-classification work be wise?

would support a standing check-in, but not to the exclusion of conditionally prioritising items that we know are already before the board

What if a P4 is in the critical path of a P1?

c). Techniques: The technique used is Urgency / Importance matrix.

4-quad might be too simplistic. Some prioritization has dependencies.(frame1)

While 4 quad works, each cycle we have noted resourcing as a point hard to disassociate from - still needs addressing and could mean a post-PC reconnection to review (frame1)

Scoring could have benefitted from decimal values to help more granularly identify tiebreaker situations (frame1)

4-quad creates artificial difference between importance and urgency

As the process matures greater complexity in systems should be considered

In general it's ok

The urgency/importance matrix was useful

4Quad causes issues between importance and urgency of an item

4 quad is a good start when resourcing etc., then follows Community review BUT mid point 'check-in' and ability to resort needs consideration

something being urgent or important was actually lost in conversion to numbers

4-quad is OK, but sometimes feels insufficiently nuanced

d). Other Please provide other topics/comments to org for feedback

Thanks to the ICANN staff for explainer materials about the frequency and techniques for the process, which were helpful in explaining the rationale behind those decisions

There were some things prioritized where it may have been helpful for this group to be able to trigger or request an ODP or have that information available to make better choice

"Bundles" / Critical Path precedent / Order of operations of things was helpful - one needs context to not place cart in front of horse.

post it word count too small :)

There's not much visibility after this exercise of the extent to which the community prioritisation assessment actually had an impact

Perhaps a webinar for appointing bodies and their possible applicants for the role of Member and Secondary should be run in future to ensure they know expectations

The team at ORG supporting and driving this have been exceptional and professional