Adigo
nashtonhart _ 2009-06-11 0402 PPT _ 1008563 _ 230825

Conference Participants listed alphabetically:

:::

Adigo Operator
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Dev Anand Teelucksingh
Garreth Shearman
Heidi Ullrich
Kevin Wilson
Matthias Langenegger
Nick Ashton-Hart
Spanish Channel

:::

Kevin:

Hello everyone. My name is Kevin Wilson. I'm the Chief Financial Officer for ICANN. Today in preparation for our Sydney meeting, we'd like to present a brief presentation on the operating plan and budget that's been posted as draft. It's expecting to be finalized and hopefully adopted by the board at the Sydney meeting in a few weeks' time.

The purpose of this discussion is just to update on the status of the development of the plan. We've clicked off a few more items on our project list. To provide some highlights of the FY'10 operating plan and budget, and invite further engagement from the community on any of the assumptions or spending priorities -- or other choices in the plan. And to ensure that the board is accurately synthesizing community input and adopts the budget.

For those that might be receiving the document and not following along in Adobe… Actually, there are no slide numbers on here, are there? I apologize. Anyway, I'm on the Overview of the FY'10 Operating Plan and Budget Slide.

There are just a few points I'd like to highlight. If you remember anything, just remember this page. This is probably the most important page.

The feedback from the community and the board -- the board finance committee and the staff -- believes that it's very important that we keep the budget growth under 5%. We must really constrain the budget. The draft plan proposed here for Sydney essentially follows that framework of constraining the growth and leveling off the growth.

Many of you know that the growth in the last few years has been closer to 30%. This budget shows 54.4 million -- which is just slightly under 5% growth from the current FY'09 year. The basic assumption is that ICANN is, in many areas, approaching what would be considered "Operational Maturity." However, we are accommodating certain growth. And particularly, contractual compliance.

Some of the technology operations and some of the base hiring that we believe is required for the new gTLD effort.

Just to reiterate -- these are not the overall financial activities that might occur in FY'10. For those who might not know, FY'10 is the period from July 1st 2009 through the 30th of June 2010. This budget, although it's being proposed for adoption… the thought is that when the new gTLD program launches, there could be significantly more revenues, in accordance with the policy associated with that. There'd be significantly associated costs with that new gTLD program, in order to process the applications and prepare them for delegation.

We don't need that budget right now; we'll need it about 90 days before the launch. So the plan is that that would be a separate budget amendment that would happen at that time.

The 17th of May was a hallmark in our finance department and the operating department. We posted the draft budget, which was 50-some pages long, on the website -- in accordance with our bylaws. That requires a budget be posted for community feedback, 45 days before our fiscal-year end, for the following fiscal year. We did that.

For those of you who read the framework of the Mexico City timeframe, it follows the format and the fundamental assumptions of that framework.

There are more comprehensive analyses. We received lots of community feedback, asking for more details and more views of the budget in different formats. So that's been provided, as well.

This is the second year, by the way, that the budget was posted first as a framework early on. For this year, it was around the Mexico City meeting. Then the operating plan and budget were lined up, and then also there was more detailed information -- as I mentioned -- and community consultation. So we're continuing that plan.

There's also been more extensive community feedback. I think I counted 50 or 60 pages of community feedback on the operating plan and budget, alone. Not to mention other aspects of our operation. So that was synthesized and analyzed, and posted onto the website, as well. Once again, to drive home the point that this is the operating plan and budget for FY'10 that would be adopted by the board in Sydney, in June.

This next slide characterizes the strategic operating plan cycle. Obviously, this is completing the operating plan development process, with the march toward Sydney in June.

This next slide with the three arrows is basically comparing how the operating plan and budget was developed. It shows, essentially, that we're providing more time for community feedback. More details, with the goal of accountability and transparency. Those [mission-critical or] critical components of ICANN. Trying to adhere more and more to those important principles.

I won't go over the strategic plan -- but the operating plan was designed to follow the tenets of the 3-year strategic plan, which was approved in January. The largest highlight, obviously, is the completion of the implementation structure for IDNs and new gTLDs.

Moving along…

Just to highlight on the slide called "Snapshot of the Operating Plan Framework…" This is actually the draft. This is my first presentation of the slide, so I can already see a few corrections that I'll make before the next presentation.

This is actually the draft operating plan document. Not the framework. It follows the framework, but… Just to highlight a few key differences…

A little bit more travel support. About $300,000 more in travel support is provided in the draft, as it appeared in the framework. The key tenets of new gTLD implementation completion -- the assumption is that that would happen in FY'10. As we mentioned before, some growth in contractual compliance and technology operation. But most departments and most headcounts are essentially staying the same.

I went through these slides a couple of times -- I think even with this group. So I'll kind of skip forward, with the hope that maybe there'll be some questions at the end. Since this is being recorded, I will just touch a sentence or two on each of the key 10 or 15 activities in the operating plan.

The first is the new gTLD implementation. As I mentioned, the assumption is that in FY'10, the project would be complete. The costs of that are associated with that.

One change that did happen from the framework… I mentioned about the extra travel. But there was also some fine-tuning of cost estimations from February 'til now. You'll see a slight increase in the professional services and staff costs for the new gTLD implementation. That's another $100,000 or 200,000 that was increased on that when we scrubbed our numbers a little bit more carefully.

Once again, just to highlight over and over that we're not planning in this budget to capture the costs of the new gTLD revenue. Nor the processing costs of the new gTLD process, with that.

The next activity on the operating plan "to do" list is the IDN implementation. The assumption here is that this includes both the IDN support of the new gTLD process, as well as the Fast Track process.

From financial assumptions, those are very closely linked. Obviously they have different paths and different processes. But the financial assumption is that they're closely connected. I'm trying to think if there's anything else there that's critical. Happy to answer questions on that.

IANA and technology operations -- as mentioned in earlier calls… There's some growth assumed in that 17% increase over the current year, as we adapt to the operational readiness and establish more automation, and provide more services in preparation for the scaled number of TLDs. Including the IDN TLDs.

Security, stability and resiliency operations. That also has some increase. About 16%. Mostly in the areas of business continuity. The cost assumptions in terms of business continuity are backup systems and that sort of thing -- with increased executive focus on

working with other Internet stakeholders. To enhance and protect the security and stability of the Internet.

Contractual compliance is probably the most straightforward. It shows a completion of the core staffing of the contractual compliance team. Including specific auditors, to enhance that. I think the passing of the new RAA will enhance their effectiveness by clarifying some of those contractual terms. It also assumes a fairly sizable cost for the "WhoIs" accuracy study, and possible follow-on.

The meetings in this are still sizable and still expensive. We believe that's a very fundamental operational requirement for ICANN to complete its work, and engage in the community. Both in face-to-face meetings, as well as in online participation. We've heard loud and clear from the community that we'd like to beef that up.

So there are some efforts to both increase remote participation and use tools that are available for that. As well as take advantage of things like smaller side meetings -- or explore new approaches to meetings, in general. Whether that's to go to two meetings or in considering a hub concept.

All of those ideas are planned to make progress in FY'10. But not too much impact on the cost assumptions. We've assumed that there'd still be the three international meetings.

Constituency is essentially continuing to support that. In response to -- and particularly the At-Large and various comments made by the At-Large…

We made a special effort in the draft budget and operating plan that was posted on the 17th of May, to highlight and describe in more detail what the support services and support costs were that we incur, in order to support -- for example -- At-Large; but all of the various constituencies and stakeholders, as well. We want to emphasize that, and we'd appreciate your feedback on that.

Policy development support. That also includes the tools and service programs to train future policy leaders. Not a lot of change in the cost structure planned for that.

Global engagement -- increasing international participation. Once again, assuming about a $400,000 cost in the fellowship program. We do have a little bit more budget. A few hundred thousand dollars over the current year in translation work.

Fortunately, we're spending our translation dollars more and more efficiently. I don't think that means we'll be spending just… I think it means we're getting more output. More budget dollars, but I think an even higher percentage, in terms of output -- and hopefully quality -- as well.

As mentioned earlier, the travel support for the ICANN community… I think that we're clear and I was clear earlier in response to strong community feedback in general. It's controversial. There are voices both to decrease funding and decrease funding for certain groups, as well as….

But the majority of the community feedback was that the ICANN-supported travel was so critical for [doing] the work of ICANN. We did add a few hundred thousand dollars for a few groups, to ensure that that group or those groups are properly funded.

Ombudsman and board support and the non-com are pretty much flat. [Close to this], for FY'09 and continuing on their functions.

GNS operations. That also had a larger percentage increase of 16%, to make sure that we're operationally capable and ready for the DNSSEC signing of the root zone, and making plans ready for that, based on the recent discussions with Department of Commerce and Verisign.

Administrative improvement is essentially our catchall for those things such as organizational reviews. That is assumed to be continued for that.

This next slide just shows the budget in a snapshot. I'm going to break it down briefly in the next few slides.

Another change that happened from the framework in Mexico City to the draft that's online now…

We brought down the revenue for two reasons. 1 -- we looked at transaction volume. We still had growth, but we had a lower-than-expected second quarter. The October-November-December period. So that was reflected in this growth rate -- although it looks like this recent quarter had a little higher growth.

To err on the side of conservatism, we've had very small increases in the transactions. That was a reduction in overall transaction volume, from what we'd shown three months ago.

Then the other point in the assumption here is that we're assuming that the transaction fees would be approved at $0.18 in the budget, as opposed to $0.20 -- which is what it is currently. And that the variable fee would be reduced by 10%. The 3.8 million that we use for variable fee would also be reduced by 10%.

That's for those people that had adopted the new RAA.   The thought being that that would provide incentive for early adoption of the RAA -- for those people who might be 5, 4, 3 years or even a year out. They would adopt it earlier and provide more protection for the registrants, than perceived by the new RAA.

Mentioned earlier in the Mexico City meeting that the dot-com fixed fee is stepping up in FY'10 to 18 million. That's still part of the equation. Once again -- just to drive home the point that new gTLD application fees are not included as part of this. That would be part of a separate gTLD budget.

I think this has been covered pretty well on the operating expenses… But just to drive home the point that we're reining in the costs, to limit our growth to 4.9%. Even though we're still aggressively completing or building out or completing those projects. That's the intention, there.

For those of you who are looking at the math -- we reduced the revenue and increased the expenses. So, what gave?

We made two changes. One is the contingency. We reduced that. We believe that our disbursement processes and our cost estimating have improved to the point where we don't believe we need as much contingency. We can manage within a tighter budget. That's part of it. Then the rest of it goes to the bottom line.

The plan is for the contribution to the reserve fund to not be as great as we had suggested in the framework earlier. This essentially reflects that. There would still be a greater budget contribution to the reserve fund than the FY'09 budget, but not as much as we believe was called for from the strategic plan. We look forward to getting feedback on that.

We talked about the new gTLD budget amendment. That's expected to launch in FY'10. I think I said all of these points before, so I'll go forward.

We also showed in the draft plan a 3-year framework model. Purposely, to show the community how we're assessing the impact on ICANN's financial position. To demonstrate the cost-recovery aspect of the budget of the new gTLD program.

The new gTLD program is not designed to increase ICANN's revenue. It's designed to have the revenue offset the costs of that incremental work. The 3-year assessment analysis shows that. Also then just to open up the door for other revenue sourcing strategies and structure.

The assumptions are essentially based on the [second] draft of the guidebook. This chart shows… Can I use the arrow? Let's see how the arrow works.

If I look over here at one of the bottom lines -- which is a 318,000 over there… That's showing the net effect. In this case, this model here that we've popped up here as an example, shows the net effect at close to zero. We didn't quite get it [laid right on]. But in this scenario, it shows just a slight positive of revenues offset by the costs of running the program. That's what that is.

This is the 3-year financial impact showing the new gTLDs once they're delegated and in operation. This chart shows the layering-in of both of those. Both the new gTLD program -- which is in bold -- and the existing core ICANN, which is in the less-bolded numbers.

You add it all up, and it shows that ICANN can remain financially healthy. We're building a model that will remain financially healthy.

These are the implications and takeaways from this analysis. The model demonstrates that the revenue covers the costs for the new gTLD application process.

It also brings forth really loud-and-clear a need that we have a detailed cost accounting and reporting system that all stakeholders and community members and board and staff are confident of. And that we're able to capture our costs in such a way to report on these things, so that we can be held accountable and transparent on those.

Another implication of this is that as ICANN matures, there are opportunities to reduce fees. There are revenue sources amongst the different sources, and other sources possibly, too.

Then finally, it shows the historical contributions to the reserve fund would be recouped up to the current strategic plan level of one year. Then we can go on to planning on having a fully funded reserve fund, and not require a contribution in our budget. We'd just require a balanced budget -- consistent with our not-for-profit nature.

In the draft budget there are also three views of the accounting system. There's the traditional accounts view. Those of us that area accountants are familiar with that -- in the Natural Accounts. There's a functional reporting view, which was shared in the framework in Mexico City. This is a new one that's on our website now. We'll be showing that variance against budget-to-actual on the functional reporting, starting in the new year.

Then, since Mexico City, we've also posted a schedule called an "expense area grouping" view. EAG. Affectionately called the "EAG Report." This is in response to community and board requests that we show our budget in a way that's more aligned with the interests in the community.

This is just to walk through what's shown on this simplified pie charts. You can see here, this is the budget in the Natural or Traditional Accounts view. This is in terms of personnel and travel and meetings. Professional services and administration.

Then this is the functional reporting. We have new gTLD and IDN assumptions. Policy-development efforts. Global engagement. So each of the 10 or 15 functional areas of the ICANN budget are shown, here.

This is the EAG report. Thank you, Cheryl. I see your comment, there. This is the EAG report. It's a little tight. Any time you do a pie chart with this many slices in a Power Point Presentation, you need to get glasses, possibly.

Essentially, it shows along the lines with what the community is asking for. This is -- in oversimplified terms -- the "G," or the support for the generic top-level domains. Including GNSO support.

This next slice is the country code support, and the support for ccTLD activities, across all the ICANN functions. By the way, each of these views of ICANN are across all departments. We did an allocation across all of them. There's a paper that's been posted and requesting community impact on that.

Probably near and dear to this group is the question of, "How much is in the At-Large budget?" So rather than ensuring individual salaries, what we're showing is really what is going toward the At-Large support [bowl].

Nick and his team -- as well as those across the organization that provide support… Even in allocation of meeting space, translation costs and those sorts of things. The paper that's on the website posted for comments is designed to illuminate that effort.

We don't want to give everybody a PhD in cost accounting, but I think for those who want to be a sophisticated reader of this, you're going to have to get a little bit schooled on the importance of the allocation efforts on this.

What's next for the community input? We're hoping to get some more online comments and synthesize those before the Sydney meeting. Then at the Sydney meeting, we'll be holding a workshop. I don't think I've been invited to the At-Large meetings, but I'm happy to join if you'd like me to. Informally or formally.

Then we have a workshop on Tuesday. I have a couple of meetings with the constituency groups on Tuesday. I'm meeting with the board, I think, on Sunday. Then obviously, the board would vote on the budget on Friday. I think it's Friday that's the board meeting.

Very good. I think that's it. Any questions or comments?

Cheryl: Kevin, I don't know whether you noted the question from Dev on the chat. He wondered what the "inner circle" in the EAG pie chart meant.

Kevin: That's good, Dev. I appreciate you asking. I do see that here.

That is a very sophisticated analysis. I say that tongue-in-cheek, but I should be serious -- because it's being recorded in three languages.

We wanted to represent that there is an inter-dependency. There's a cross-costing aspect of this. When you look at any one of these slices, individuals' time is allocated. Real estate costs are allocated. Overhead costs are allocated.

There are some direct costs. Certain individuals might be supporting one of these groups 100% of their time. Or there might be a consultant that's hired.

For example, travel support for a particular group might be in one of those slices. But there's a very large section of the ICANN budget that's very, very much cross-collateralized. We wanted to make sure that wasn't lost.

Our designers came up with this idea of having an inner circle, to show that those costs are integrated. It doesn't mean you can take your slice and say, "Gee -- I'd like to do At-Large and ALAC support for 7% of the budget in a separate way." There are too many cross-dependencies.

Dev: Okay.

Spanish Channel: A question from Spanish, when you get a chance.

Kevin: Sure. Dev -- did that answer your question?

Dev: Okay. Yes, it did. But this Expense of EAG chart isn't in the actual budget, is it? I don't recall seeing this, before.

Kevin: Yes.

Dev: [inaudible]

Kevin: Actually, the board finance committee wanted to review that after the 17th of May. Their first meeting was after the 17th of May. Actually, their meeting was on the 15th of May,

and we weren't able to put it in there. We left a place-marker in there. You're right. It hasn't been posted inside the budget. It will be.

However, it was posted as a separate paper. If you'd like to, we can send you a link to that paper. It's a 10- or 12-page paper. It describes the details and would answer the question in more detail.

Cheryl: If we could put that link into the notes space here on this meeting, that would also help others locate it, rather than in the plethora of lists.

Kevin: Okay. Great. Just go to the main website and I can show you. The ICANN website. Yes. I think that's good.

All right. There was another question while we put that in there. We'll do that. Then was there a question you said in Spanish?

Spanish Channel: Yes. From Spanish.

Kevin: Yo hablo un poquito español.

Spanish Channel: First of all, good afternoon. My name is [Tasilda de Simon] Brazil. First of all, I wanted to say that we definitely recognize the great efforts in translation. We are definitely getting a lot more documents. We are getting a better understanding of how ICANN is working. Especially at the ALAC level.

I do have two questions or two doubts. The first one is looking at the portion for the travel policy. On Page 7, there's a mention that there's going to be a reduction for the participation of the [inaudible]. And we know that it's important to have regional meetings that will take one or two days. We know that that's important. Once a year, we need to see each other.

But, we also think it's necessary that when we have the general assembly meetings for ICANN, to coincide with when we have to do the regional meetings. We think that's very important.

It's important that our representatives participate during all the days that the ICANN meetings take place. That way, we are able to not only have a general assembly, but also participate in the workshops and the workgroups that are formed and related to the ICANN meetings.

Then on another part, what I did want to ask was… Do you know if, in this budget, you've also anticipated new technologies? Or support services for remote participation, for example. I know that for Mexico and New Delhi, there are members in the community for [the caller / RACALO] for example, who would love to participate. But it was really difficult or impossible for them.

Finally, we want to know if it's going to be possible to organize or to request to the At-Large staff [or/to] organize more teleconferences during the month. Not just one teleconference. But to be able to organize other teleconferences, for us to meet amongst LACRALO. To speak about the document or politics that have been created that the staff has sent us for comments.

So that we are able to not only have these comments in the period, but also to be able to discuss this within the teleconference. That way LACRALO can start organizing.

Cheryl: I don't know if what I just said was clear.

Kevin: I think I heard a lot of good thoughts. Then I heard -- I think -- two questions.

Let me restate what I think the questions are, and see if I am close. Okay?

The first question is, "Is there budget provided for general assemblies or regional meetings? As opposed to just coming to the ICANN meetings."

Then the second question is, "Are there budget or operating plan activities planned for more remote participation?" Did I oversimplify it?

Spanish Channel: The first question is incomplete. We think it's important to have at least one regional meeting per year. We've all agreed that that can be a smaller meeting. Either one or two days. That would reduce the cost.

But we also believe that our regional meeting [should] coincide with one of the normal ICANN meetings -- one of the general assemblies. It would be important that we could all participate. We could also all be present during the large ICANN meeting, because that will give us the opportunity to not only…

For example, in Mexico… There was a conference in regard to phishing. That, for example, is something that a lot of us would've missed, if we would've left. It was very important for a lot of us to participate in that.

If our regional meetings are maybe organized to be done at the same time of the ICANN meetings, but we're only able to stay one or two days, we are not able to participate in those workshops, for example.

Kevin: Right.

I think those are really good thoughts and suggestions. I can address the issue of what the financial assumptions are, as far as regional meetings and how to assist in that. If that would be helpful.

Spanish Channel: Yes, please.

Kevin: The first is, each of these is very, very important. There are -- in the operating plan -- budget dollars and room. Including public participation and community participation, to ensure that these are addressed and that we're looking at strategies.

Obviously, as the CFO, I can't help but enter in my own bias -- which is to spend money efficiently. If we can get twice as much work done for half the cost, I'll be the first to advocate that. I'm hoping that everyone else would join in that, as well. If we can do that.

So those comments have been actively noted in the draft operating plan and budget

comments. In fact, we've shared those comments with the staff that are heavily involved in the public participation effort. That's the good news.

Comments are being heard. They're being analyzed and responded to and addressed. We continue to want to encourage that effort.

As far as the actual budget dollars on whether there's a regional meeting in each region -- one a year -- or whether it's aligned with the ICANN meeting or not… For those that have read the details of the travel guidelines, you'll see we've kind of left that open a little bit. At least for the At-Large and ALAC section of the travel support guidelines. We're hoping to get feedback on that before we finalize that.

Cheryl: Oh, you can put that to the bank, my dear.

Kevin: Yes. We're looking forward to getting direct feedback.

I was sort of the champion of this. I think I've gotten pretty good staff support on this. But it's controversial, as well, to not make it very specific. Instead, to have general allocations.

The idea is that if a group can figure out how to spend some of their travel-support dollars in a more-efficient way -- and therefore, have more people, for example -- by having a local meeting… and you can add one or two people… then we'd want to support that. That was one of the intentions of the way we designed that, in particular, there.

That was a long-winded way of saying, "Yes. It's in there." Do we have it explicit on which groups are meeting where and why? We didn't think that should be a top-down type thing. We should wait 'til we get clearer indications.

Each group has its own version of that in the travel-support guidelines. The idea is that the best decisions are made at the local level, or the individual level. We want to decentralize that decision-making process, as much as possible.

All within the constraints of fiscal responsibility and fairness, too. We don't want to have a free-for-all and generate criticism from other groups for having that. At the same time, we realize -- specifically the At-Large, who's expressed -- a desire to spend money more efficiently, by taking better advantage of the regional meetings.

So the answer is, "Yes. We're there." We're looking for feedback, to make sure that we're heading in the right direction and at the right speed.

Cheryl: The second part of the question, Kevin, was -- of course -- the new technologies and efficiencies. Up until now -- and this is me saying it -- "Its appalling global remote participation history we've had."

Kevin: Yes.

We've heard that feedback. It's been forwarded on. Do I have in the budget a specific technology that's going to take care of all of this? No. We don't.

But we do have budget dollars to study and look at that. Like I say -- if we can find a way to more efficiently and more effectively get more participation remotely, there will be a strong impetus to do that.

My understanding -- I wish Karen were here. Nick and Matthias and Heidi probably can share more…

My understanding is that we're getting better and better. I don't know the statistics off the top of my head. But my understanding is that the remote participation aspect of our meetings is getting stronger and stronger.

I'm sure all of us would like it to be even better, but my sense is that we're heading in the right direction. Once again, I'm sure they and we would like to have feedback for that.

Cheryl: So there's a lot more to go, for it to be genuinely effective at a global level. Where the variations in bandwidth accessibility and -- quite literally -- variety in the modality. So that we get closer to our research being a unified communications suite that we could choose from. To end up with identical data and interchange going on within each of those possible choices. That's obviously the endgame.

It'd be nice to get there. It's not going to happen overnight, and it will cost to do so. But something as unique as ICANN is probably one of the few places that that sort of thing can be effectively explored.

Kevin: Right. Good.

I see your comment here, too -- about the ALAC review as it gets finalized. I would like to explore that more. In particular, the items that affect the budget. To have that factored into that.

I'm looking forward to meeting with… I personally know that it's not a purpose of this call, but I'm looking forward to meeting with Tricia and you on that.

Cheryl: That would be excellent.

Kevin, you mentioned we haven't given you an invitation to come and speak at any of our particular meetings. As you can imagine, we have a helluva lot to do, and a very small amount of time to do it, in Sydney.

Whether or not the following happens in Sydney, or if we can at least make some first steps… You mentioned -- particularly when you were looking at the EAG and the multi views… That a degree of sophistication in the analysis and the reading of the not-so-pretty pie chart… Actually, how those figures turn into a very pretty pie chart is required.

We do, of course, have an At-Large advisory committee budget and finance subcommittee. That has representatives from each of the regions.

I'm wondering if it might be possible for a slightly more intensive and detailed interchange to go on with that subgroup and yourself -- and anyone else who's mad enough or motivated

enough to join in. Rather than trying to drag a full global community down a pathway which -- to be totally honest -- would bore most people to absolute death.

[laughter]

We might want to explore that, perhaps, in Sydney -- and see what we can do. Particularly with a view to the needs that we're going to have to look at and analyze in a post-ALAC review environment.

Kevin: I think I would really appreciate that. I know I'm doing that with the CCNSO strategic SOP working group. Strategic Operations Plan working group.

Cheryl: Yes. Like all of our meetings, it would be open. It would be recorded. It would be totally transparent. But it wouldn't be an expectation on our complete community or attendees to be part of it.

Kevin: Right.

Cheryl: Rather, those who have been silly enough to put their hand up and say that yes, they want to be part of the subcommittee.

Kevin: Right. Yes. The goal of these charts… and some in the community are already giving feedback that they'd like to see different slices of it.

The general first initial comments are, "We appreciate that you're heading in the right direction. Now let's go further." That sort of thing as a comment.

I sense exactly what you're saying. There are some community members that really are interested in a detailed [unmasking] of the detailed question -- which we really welcome. At the same time, we want to -- as you say -- not put everybody to sleep when they get involved.

Cheryl: Well, that -- plus there are only so many hours in a day. Even at an ICANN meeting. We do actually need policy work to come out of it, as well.

Kevin: Right.

Cheryl: Can our people talk to your people and see what we can sort out there?

Kevin: Sure. I'm looking at my people, and they're all nodding their heads very, very enthusiastically.

V: All the people are all here together.

Cheryl: [laughter]

[laughter]

Cheryl: Honest -- I really wish you'd put on a webcam, so I could see you all squeezed into whatever sized office Heidi has.

[laughter]

V: Matthias, you can send yours on.

Cheryl: [laughter]

V: Yes. You can. The Adobe Connection -- you can turn it on.

Cheryl: I have images of you all huddled around a little desk in a corner room. [laughter]

Are there any other questions? I don't see anybody's hand up.

V: Can you see us?

Cheryl: In a minute! Wait a minute! It's trying. I can see a logo. It doesn't look like your… You're transmitting "voice." There you go! Hello, Kevin! Ah!

V: Ah! Yes!

Vs: [inaudible]

Cheryl: There we go!

[laughter]

Cheryl: The famous whiteboard. I'm impressed!

V: Yes.

Kevin: I don't know how that looks in Spanish or French.

Garreth: But you can get there, yet. This is Garreth.

Cheryl: I was just muting my laptop, so we don't get triple feedback. Otherwise we're going to have loops within loops.

Thank you very much, Kevin, for the time and energy you've put into this. I know it's practice for the main event in Sydney, but we certainly appreciate it. The focus is very much to ensure that the Latin American and Caribbean region and the Spanish-speaking community have everything that they need out of it.

If I can just go back to my own, I'll ask those on the Spanish channel if there's anything else they'd like to ask. Or a placeholder for a future question they might like to raise? I'm sure Kevin will take questions with notice, as well.

Spanish Channel: No. First of all, I'm very grateful for your answers. I definitely hope that the remote participation is something that works in Sydney. Unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to attend. But I'm certainly going to maintain that the LACRALO community definitely insist in the comments that I made. And I absolutely thank you for your response.

Kevin: Great. Thank you very much. We look forward to getting your feedback, as well, on how well we do.

Cheryl: Of course, you won't mind if it comes to you in Spanish, will you, Kevin?

Kevin: I don't.

Cheryl: [laughter]

[laughter]

Cheryl: I wasn't joking. I think it's really important that commies can put to ICANN their comments, in the language of their choice.

Kevin: Yes. You should know that the draft operating plan and budget… The framework was posted in the five UN languages.

The draft operating plan and budget, I saw had been close to translation. I don't think that's actually posted on the website, but it will be, very shortly.

The travel guidelines, I think, have been posted in Spanish and French. Right?

V: I don't know -- yet.

Kevin: Not yet? Okay. There are lots of documents to be translated right now, with the IDN.

Cheryl: Sure.

Of course, we look forward to the wonderful day when there isn't a lag between one language and another.

Kevin: Yes.

Cheryl: I must say, with the ALAC review, I've actually asked them to hold up the English version until the rest of the versions were ready. But they weren't comfortable with that radical approach.

Kevin: Right.

You should know, though… It's just a little chit. We're heading in the right direction in our project planning. For example, on the 17th of May -- the budget deadline… We build days into that, knowing that there will be translations.

Even so -- you know how it is. When you have a board finance committee on the 15th of May, it's very challenging to incorporate those before the 17th. But that's being built into the plan.

Cheryl: We're not suggesting it's easy. [laughter]

Kevin: Yes. Thank you very much.

Cheryl:　　　Well, thank you very much, Kevin. I'm sure that the whole of the Spanish-speaking community who'll be looking at these archives greatly appreciate the effort and energy you've put into today's presentation.

I look forward very much to following up in Sydney with you, and having our subcommittee and interested parties getting a little bit more drill-down and in-service education. Particularly on the EAG part of the equation.

For that, however, Nick -- I think we probably need to try to ensure that there is a possibility of remote participation. So that interested parties can in fact join in, as well. Or if not, that it's fully archived and recorded. So that it becomes a community resource.

Kevin: Excellent. Okay. Thank you very much. Cheryl, see you in Sydney.

Cheryl:　　　Yes.

Kevin: I look forward to talking to you in about 8 hours, if you're going to be on the call.

Cheryl:　　　Yes. I suspect we might be chatting again today, Kevin.

Kevin: Okay. Thanks so much.

Cheryl:　　　Thank you all. Bye.

Kevin: Bye, now.

Cheryl:　　　Thanks, Maya.

V:　　Okay.

V:　　Bye-bye.

[farewells about]

[session ends]