SOPC comments on Draft ICANN FY25 Plans

Introduction

The ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Committee (SOPC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on Draft ICANN FY25-29 Operating & Financial Plan and Draft ICANN FY25 Operating Plan, Draft IANA FY25 Operating Plan and Budget and Draft ICANN FY25 Budget.

The SOP working group was created at the Cairo ICANN meeting in November 2008. The working group became a Committee in November 2017 and the terms of Reference were reviewed and updated in 2022. The goal of the Committee is to coordinate, facilitate, and encourage the involvement of ccTLD managers in ICANN's strategic and operational, planning and budgetary processes. Membership of the Committee is open to representatives from all ccTLD managers (members and non-members of the ccNSO).

According to the SOPC Charter, the Committee may - as part of its activities - on its own behalf take a position and/or provide input on the public comments forum, and subsequently relate back to ICANN and/or other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and/or advisory WGs. Therefore the views expressed in this submission are of the SOPC's only. They are not necessarily those of the ccNSO (Council and/or its membership) nor from the ccTLD community at large, nor individual ccTLD Managers. The SOPC is also mandated through its Terms of Reference to submit a Rejection Action Petition when deemed necessary.

As part of the 2022 review of its Terms of Reference, the SOPC reviewed its working methods. As a result, the SOPC focuses, but does not restrict itself, to those areas of ICANN's planning considered relevant for ccTLDs.

To assist the reader in going through the SOPC's comments, general observations and comment on ICANN's plans are included in section 1 of this submission. Specific comments on Operating Initiatives and Functional Activities are included in sections 2 and 3 respectively, observations and comments with respect to financials and Budget are included in section 4. Finally, section 5 includes Other Comments and Observations. Comments on IANA's operating plans and budget are included in a separate document.

To add color and depth to this SOPC submission, the preparatory work done by SOPC and ccTLD managers to identify ccNSO priorities and topics of most interest is described and included as Annex A. Please note Annex A is only included as background information and not part of the actual comments and observations on the FY25 planning documents.

If you have any questions with respect to this SOPC submission, please do not hesitate to reach out to us.

On behalf of the Committee,
Andreas Musielak, chair of the SOP Committee
Irina Danelia, vice-chair of the SOP Committee

Section 1. General observations, comments, and suggestions

The SOPC notes that the document format is consistent with last year's format and no major differences with last year's documents. Although the CEO Goals are mentioned throughout the document – the status of which is unclear to us in relation to the Strategic and other Plans and the community priority is unclear to us - they appear to be consistent with overall long- term plans and provide a useful emphasis for FY25 activities.

Risks and Dependencies

With respect to the identified risks and dependencies affecting the proposed activities, including to what extent progress is dependent on community contributions (specifically ccTLD related persons), the risk overall assessment for each Operating Initiative and Functional area appear to be adequate. Where considered needed specific comments are provided.

KPIs

The SOPC notes that the work on defining KPIs has further evolved in some areas, but additional work is needed. The SOPC believes that by their very nature the term operating plan suggests the inclusion of operational goals, which are specific sub-goals, milestones, and metrics to measure progress/achievement against the goals included in the strategic plan. Ideally, they also include timelines. With this in mind it is not always clear which targets are planned for completion during and at the end of the planning horizon.

The SOPC wants to reiterate our comment on the FY23 Plans. The SOPC believes ICANN and the community should jointly review the current non-transactional metrics and KPIs to assess whether they measure what they are supposed to measure. As stated in 2022, for example actual progress on achieving milestones or sub-goal against the stated goal of a project in which the community is involved is of relevance from a community perspective. In its response on this suggestion ICANN indicated it would engage with the community in FY23 to identify potential improvements. To date the SOPC has not seen any follow-up on this commitment, and would like to understand, whether we can expect such a follow-up and if so, when, how etc. In our view, reporting to the community only adds value when there is a mutual understanding on what is reported upon.

Reporting

Related to the recurring comments on KPI's, we reiterate our comments with respect to reporting of progress in achieving goals and objectives contained in the operating plans. The SOPC notes that in response to previous comments on progress reporting ICANN referred to the CEO's quarterly reports to the Board. The SOPC points out that the latest publicly

available version relates to the period December 2022- March 2023[1]. Further, the SOPC believes that although the CEO reports do provide a wealth of information on activities and achievements of the various ICANN functions, there is no direct relation with the objectives and goals in the annual and five-year operating plans, nor is progress reported against projected milestones or sub-goals included in the planning (in part due to the lack of relevant KPIs).

Further, ICANN indicates that internally progress is tracked against all of its Operating Initiatives and Functional Activities. The SOPC would appreciate an indication whether these data points are publicly available, for example included in the CEO's quarterly reports, or reported in a different manner? In addition, if the data is only shared with the ICANN Board or one of its committees, does the latter provide any public assessments beyond Q&A sessions at the ICANN meetings?

Activity Based Reporting

The SOPC welcomes and appreciates introducing "Activity Based Reporting" as it provides additional depth in understanding the proportion of resources allocated to each activity, but requests to maintain the "traditional View" in future relevant material to allow comparison.

ccNSO Policies implementation

In the comments on ICANN's Draft FY24–28 Operating & Financial Plan and Draft FY24 Operating Plan & Budget SOPC raised an issue on support for the implementation of ccNSO policy recommendations. ICANN responded that this support may be provided by a variety of functions across the organization, depending on the subject matter.

SOPC failed to see any mention of implementation of ccNSO policy recommendations In draft Draft ICANN FY25-29 Operating & Financial Plan and Draft ICANN FY25 Operating Plan and Draft IANA FY25 Operating Plan and Budget. Therefore we suggest ICANN to carefully review ongoing policy development processes that are completed or close to completion and to include the activities to implement such policies in the FY25 Operating Plan. SOPC expects to see completion of ccNSO PDP3 Retirement Policy recommendations approved by ICANN Board on September, 22 2022 (if not completed earlier), implementation of ccNSO PDP 3 Review Mechanism Policy (submitted for Board approval) and ccNSO PDP4 IDN recommendation (to be completed in 2024 calendar year).

SOPC has made this comment in relation to Draft PTI FY25 Operating Plan and Budget and repeats it here.

---

[1] Checked on 29 January 2024: https://www.icann.org/en/ceo-corner/ceo-reports-to-the-board

Section 2. Specific Comments on Operating Initiatives

First of all, we would like to point out that SOPC has analyzed all operating initiatives. However the SOPC comments are limited to those on which the SOPC had comments and are considered relevant for ccTLDs.

Support the evolution and strengthening of root zone management

The SOPC believes that there is a general consensus that the evolution and strengthening of root zone management is at the core of ICANN's mission and part of the raison-d'etre of ICANN.

Given the criticality of these operating initiatives the SOPC was surprised to find the following in the planning documents: *"The greatest risk is the possible loss of development resources that are prioritized to other objectives."* The SOPC would like to understand what kind of other objectives might crowd out important root-zone related development work and which other objectives are considered of a higher priority.

In this context we like to draw your attention to our comment with respect to the PTI budget i.e the need to ensure that adequate funding and resources are available and allocated to PTI.

Evolve and Strengthen the Multistakeholder Model to Facilitate Diverse and Inclusive Participation in Policymaking

According to the draft plans the purpose of the operating initiative Evolve and Strengthen the Multistakeholder Model to Facilitate Diverse and Inclusive Participation in Policymaking is to ensure that participation in the policy development work of ICANN's three Supporting Organizations (SOs) and advice developed by the four Advisory Committees (ACs) is globally representative. However, the SOPC notes that in its view the scope of this initiative tends to describe existing processes rather than efforts to increase global representation.

The observation in the plan that resources "*are likely to be needed to support improved or new virtual collaboration tools and more face-to-face or intersessional meetings to advance or complete major policy projects and allow for globally representative participation*" is supported by the SOPC. However, it is not clear whether additional resources are provided to achieve the purpose, given the "stable funding" from FY24 to FY25.

Further, it is also not clear to the SOPC how the goal of this initiative is intended to be achieved. The added value of providing improved or new collaboration tools to the same group of people, or more face-to-face or intersessional meetings to an existing group of volunteers, who already risk burnout is not clear to the SOPC. Therefore, the SOPC would like to understand the actual activities under this initiative and resources available to evolve and strengthen the multistakeholder model, also taking into account the clearly identified risk of volunteer burnout.

Evolve and Strengthen the ICANN Community's Decision-Making Processes to Ensure Efficient and Effective Policymaking

The focus for FY25 includes:

- Deploying uniform project and program management tools across each SO and AC and training of relevant staff.
- Continuing migration to the CES platform.
- Continuing collaboration between ICANN's Planning and Policy Development Support functions to engage the community in collaborative prioritization of community work in view of limited resources.

Resources are identified as stable with possible increase in travel and system migration expenditure. Risks around prioritization and complexity are clearly identified. The interest of the ccNSO in increased cross-community and diverse stakeholder engagement would suggest increased funding will be needed under this initiative to achieve ambitions in this area.

Promote and evolve the DNS through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets while ensuring the stability, security, and resiliency of the DNS.

The SOPC notes that the draft plan does not consider the ccNSO and its work in this area through the recently created ccNSO universal acceptance committee (UAC).

Further, the SOPC after consulting the ccNSO UAC notes that the envisioned scope of promotion is limited. It does not include the following items:

- UA readiness have to be adopted also for devices that process domain names and email addresses (like the multi-function machine that scan document and send the scanned copy to email address)
- It does not consider the tools for DNS management, Anti-Spam tools, email affiliated programs like address book manager or meeting manager.
- The role of Governments is not considered although they could play an important role for UA adoption policies. For example, governments could be encouraged to make UA mandatory for any application, device and systems through their procurement processes.
- Any system that has a communication with ICANN UA-Ready systems should be UA-Ready as well so we have a consistent environment as a return. (Like travel support portal)

Geopolitical Monitoring, Engagement, and Mitigation

In the Draft FY25 Operating Plan this initiative is summarized with a narrow focus "*The Government and IGO Engagement (GE) team at ICANN takes a strategic approach to prioritizing and targeting its engagement activities, guided by their identification of emerging trends and continuous monitoring of governmental initiatives. Through targeted engagement,*

ICANN org focuses on two areas: working with governments and IGOs engaged with ICANN org and the policy development process through ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), and more broadly, working with governments and IGOs on issues beyond those being addressed through an ICANN policy development process."

The SOPC notes that with exception of the reference to work with the GAC, other efforts to effectively leverage and assist in building the narrative in the engagement process are not reflected under this initiative.

The ccNSO has identified in its comment last year a broader need for ICANN to also engage with ccTLD Managers, their regional organizations and committees such as the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee (IGLC), given their proximity to national governments and the ccNSO's global membership (from 174 countries and territories). The SOPC notes that in last year's response to these comments, this concern was not addressed either in the planning or in the responses. The SOPC notes that this concern is again not reflected in the Initiative.

In this context the SOPC wants to reiterate its comments from last year that it is not clear whether sufficient resources will be provided to expand the scope of activities under this initiative to include outreach to and engage ccTLD managers and regional organizations in the area of activities.

Adequate resourcing becomes even more pressing given the tight timeframes and the clear identification of lack of adequate resourcing as a risk factor.

Improve the Depth of Understanding of the Domain Name Market Drivers That Impact ICANN's Funding (completed)

The SOPC notes that the milestones have been reached to improve the depth of understanding of the domain name marketplace drivers that impact ICANN's funding. The SOPC supports the transition of this initiative into an ongoing functional activity.

SOPC appreciates the acknowledged lack of clarity on how the evolution of the market and wider threats may impact the ICANN funding model, it also believes that the process itself to understand the evolution of the market and related matters, should be considered part of the on-going and recurring business activities.

In addition, the SOPC suggests defining, measuring and reporting appropriate KPIs for such ongoing functional activity. Specifically, greater transparency as to how ICANN will continue to expand its understanding and knowledge of the potential threats to the funding model would be welcomed. The SOPC would also seek assurance that data sets to support forecasting processes will be shared with the community and input will be sought to further enhance and validate these data sets.

Implement New gTLD auction proceeds recommendations as approved by the Board.

The SOPC welcomes that the Grant Program has been launched and considers it is a testament of ICANN's maturity.

Planning at ICANN

The SOPC notes that whilst milestones are mentioned, specific KPIs are not always detailed. The plan introduces enhancements, but the details on specific actions are not explicitly outlined.

The SOPC welcomes and supports the Planning Prioritization Process, which serves its purpose. The SOPC is committed to stay involved.

With respect to progress reporting, we note that in response to previous comments on progress reporting ICANN referred to the CEO's quarterly reports to the Board. The SOPC wants to point out that latest publicly available version relates to the period December 2022-March 2023[2]. Further, the SOPC believes that although the CEO reports do provide a wealth of information on activities and achievements of the various ICANN functions, a direct relation with the annual and five year operating plan is not directly clear, nor is progress against the planning (in part due to the lack of relevant KPI's).

ICANN Reserves (Completed)

First, the SOPC commends ICANN on its efforts to safeguard ICANN's long-term financial sustainability and agrees that this Operating Initiative is successfully completed. In the past the SOPC stressed the importance of maintaining a solid reserve to finance its operations.

Noting that the reserves fund is at a level above "*an amount equal to one year of operating expenses as the minimum target level*" the SOPC welcomes additional discussion and consideration of an "appropriate" rather than "minimum" level of the Reserve Fund to avoid excessive reserves when funds might be better spent on other activities, and is available to engage in such a discussion with ICANN.

---

[2] Checked on 29 January 2024: https://www.icann.org/en/ceo-corner/ceo-reports-to-the-board

Section 3. Specific comments on Functional Activities

Technical & DNS Security Services Group, IANA Functions

The SOPC notes that from a ccTLD perspective the functional activities in the area of Technical & DNS Security Services Group, IANA Functions are critical and continuity and an adequate level of the services provided in this area needs to be guaranteed. Therefore the SOPC urges ICANN to ensure IANA is adequately resourced and when needed additional resources are provided to IANA. IANA needs to be in a position to deliver on additional anticipated activities such as implementation of new policies and implementing potential updates to IANA Function service level agreements.

In addition, the SOPC expresses its concern that specifically with respect to the IANA function, losing staff may significantly impact this core function. Most roles in the team lack redundancy and filling positions when staff depart has often proved challenging. The SOPC urges ICANN to ensure redundancy in skills among staff, also in light of the upcoming round of new gTLDs.

Policy Development and implementation Support Service Group

Strategic Initiatives Functional Activity
The SOPC notes that it includes the support of work undertaken by the community, such as the coordination of ICANN's strategy as it relates to compliance with the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and other global data protection and privacy legislation; mitigating DNS security threats; special projects related to the New gTLD Program: Next Round, IDNs, and UA-related topics. The SOPC notes that the focus seems to be on gTLDs and more technical topics.

Constituent and Stakeholder Travel Functional Activity
The SOPC notes the plan reflects a business as usual approach. The SOPC believes that this does not align well with operating initiatives to increase diversity and broaden the base of multi stakeholders actively participating. The SOPC would welcome initiatives in this area to initiate a conversation if and how travel funding could strengthen the aforementioned operating initiatives.

Community Engagement and Services Service Group

Global Stakeholder Engagement Functional Activity
The SOPC notes that the manner in which the activities are described lean towards an approach of "engagement for the sake of engagement". The objectives and underlying operational goals and milestones of the engagement efforts are not clear. The SOPC believes that the intent of the activities in this area is to promote and leverage its unique role that is not reflected in this functional area.

The SOPC notes there is no reflection on the engagement activities with ccTLD managers and related organizations. In line with last year's comments the SOPC believes that closer cooperation between ICANN and the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee, relevant working groups of the Regional ccTLD organizations, and when and where needed individual ccTLD Managers will be beneficial to the goals of the activities in this area.

The SOPC notes again that most initiatives and activities are very focused towards gTLD and hardly refer to ccTLDs.
Given the increased needs for engagement the SOPC believes it is unlikely that stable funding will be sufficient to meet these needs.

Regional Offices Functional Activity
The SOPC believes that individual ccTLD managers could contribute effectively to engagement with local and regional stakeholders but this is not reflected, nor is partnership considered in the activities as described.

Engagement Programs Functional Activity
As an illustration of how the ccNSO and/or individual ccTLD managers could support activities in this area, the SOPC would like to refer to the a ccNSO session during ICANN78 on Corporate Social Responsibility. This session is directly related to environmental and other areas of sustainability. The SOPC notes that although ICANN's environmental sustainability strategy project is part of ICANN Interim President and CEO Goals (Goal 8 for FY24) and reflected in the FY25 engagement programs, no reference to engagement or partnerships with ccNSO or ccTLD managers is made in this area, nor an effort to learn from ccTLD Managers in this or other areas.

Governmental and Intergovernmental Organization Engagement Functional Activity It
is the understanding of the SOPC that ICANN's Global Engagement team is responsible for outreach and engagement with national and regional governments and IGOs to inform the stakeholders of ICANN's mission and mandate of ICANN. The team acts as a central point of contact within ICANN to help governments and IGOs understand and be mindful of the way the Internet functions and the role ICANN plays in technical Internet governance."

In line with last year's comment (FY24 SOPC submission) the SOPC believes there is a need to reflect on these engagement efforts, including on when and how individual ccTLD managers should/could be part of these efforts to build and support effective global engagement activities with local governments and IGOs. In last year's comments the SOPC already noted this will to a large extent avoid counter-productive engagement efforts.
As stated above, the SOPC believes that adequate resourcing in this area is needed, for example to execute ICANN's WSIS +20 agenda.

Global Communications and Language Services Functional Activity
The SOPC is keen to support broader and enhanced participation in ccNSO and ICANN by a more diverse (making meaning for "multi" in multistakeholder) and well supported "new to ICANN" ccTLD managers. This was a topic discussed that emerged recently in various sessions on how the ccNSO remains to be relevant for the next few years. One of the outcomes of that discussion was that language support is needed to ensure productive and effective participation of new participants in ICANN. The SOPC suggests continuing

adequate support in this realm, including live interpretation and transliteration at ccNSO meetings, including Tech day.

ICANN org Shared Services Service Group

Planning Functional Activity

The SOPC notes that in this year's planning there is a stronger emphasis on timely reporting and metrics for plan and strategic plan progress compared with the previous one. We appreciate this approach, however we do want to note that this has been committed to in the past, but to date we have not seen great progress in this area.

The SOPC notes that the budget for Planning Functional Activity increases vs FY24. Two more Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) lead to 0.4 million USD increasing. Our interpretation is that each FTE leads to 200 thousand USD per year. SOPC would appreciate the explanation of the reason to employ two more FTE.

Finance and Procurement Functional Activity

The SOPC notes that this function now has additional roles: to support 'Implement New gTLD auction proceeds recommendations' and 'Financial analysis specific to the New gTLD Program: Next Round'. The SOPC considers this to be appropriate.

The SOPC notes that although in this section the Objectives are defined, the underlying targets and/or milestones necessary to measure progress towards achieving the objectives are not adequately defined.

The SOPC further seeks clarity as to where and when efficiencies and process improvements are reported to the community and how the community will know financial analysis is improving.

Section 4. Comments on Draft FY25 Budget

Funding

SOPC supports the use of the "base" scenario and therefore a conservative approach for the FY25 budget. The assumption about the growth-rate in the "base-scenario" is consistent with growth-rates members of the SOPC observe.

Activity Based Reporting

The SOPC welcomes and appreciates introducing "Activity Based Reporting" as it provides additional depth in understanding the proportion of resources allocated to each activity but requests to maintain the "Traditional View" in future relevant material as well to allow comparison.

It is our understanding that the Draft Budget (by its very nature) provides planned expenses allocated by activity. We see even more value in seeing actual figures for both FY24 and FY25 reported in the same manner (by activity). Further, we wonder whether the activity-based reporting is based on any method of activity- based costing and/or ICANN will be moving in that direction?

Grant Program

As stated before, the SOPC welcomes that the Grant Program has been launched and considers it is a testament of ICANN's maturity. In its comments to FY24 Draft Budget SOPC expressed concern regarding the costs of executing the Grant Program which was planned to be 4 million USD or 40% of the amount of the Projected Grants Distributed (10 million USD) not including the Technical and DNS Security service area. SOPC notes that actual FY24 forecasts predict these costs as 2 million USD and Draft FY25 Budget includes another 2 million USD. The SOPC would like to understand if ICANN considers ways to improve the ratio, either by increasing the annual level of grants, making the process more efficient or a combination.

Reserve Fund

The SOPC notes that the Reserve Fund is invested according to a conservative Investment Policy and commends ICANN on its transparency with respect to its investment strategy. SOPC notes that the Reserve Fund will grow with approximately 2 million USD due to Investment income in FY 25 and the growth was higher in previous years (an average of about four percent per fiscal year during the last 5 years). The SOPC wonders whether the income from investment will off-set the expected inflation, and - if not – whether ICANN would consider adjusting Investment Policy or making additional donations to the Reserve Fund.

Funds and transfers

Section 9.3.1 Total ICANN FY24 Forecast (page 47) shows the Board-Approved Transfers: Operating Fund Excess to SFICR 20 millions USD, SFICR to to fund Next Round until June 2024 – 13 millions.

In the Financial Overview section (page 7-8, new gTLD Program) it is explained that $26 millions expenses are related to Next Round implementation, out of this 26 million $18 million will be transferred from the SFICR, the rest $8 million will be covered by the New gTLD Fund.

In practical terms this implies that for the upcoming year the next new gTLD Round implementation work is mostly funded from the Operating Fund Excess (via SFICR) and minor part of funding comes from New gTLD Fund. Given the earmarking and specificity of the SFICR Fund, the SOPC expresses a concern that using a large portion of this Fund for next new gTLD round purposes crowds out other activities pertaining to other initiatives in which the whole community participated.

FY25 Budget versus FY24 Forecast

The SOPC believes there is a discrepancy that we believe may need to be cleared up in the FY25 budget: The travel/meeting cost forecast drops from $17M for FY24 to $13M for FY25 (section 4.1, page 12)).

That should be a 'favorable' change of $4M in FY25. But the "Favorable/(Unfavorable) vs. FY24 Forecast" column shows a 'favorable' change of only $3M. So that should be changed to $4M or the numbers for Travel & Meetings for FY24 and/or FY25 need to be adjusted. We would appreciate understanding if this might be due to rounding the figures or due to another factor.

Minor corrections

For the record we mention the corrections that were mentioned in SOPC Clarifying Questions and acknowledged by the Planning team . It is our understanding that they will be reflected in the next published version:

- (page24) Needs to modify "GDD Summit" on 4.4.4 "Constituent Travel"(page 24) to "CPH Summit".
- (page25) Needs to modify "ICANN 80 -TBD" on page 25 to "ICANN 80 Kigali".

Section 5. Other Comments and Observations

ABR related comment

In 2023 ICANN suggested eliminating the Additional Budget Request (ABR) process and advised to submit ABRs as a part of Public Comment. This suggestion aimed to simplify the overall budget process. The ccNSO Council supported the simplification of the ABR process, but requested ICANN to provide a template to use for submitting ABR. In reviewing the public comment documentation the SOPC did not find such a template. In order to avoid confusion between comments on the planning documents and specific budget requests the SOPC asks ICANN to provide a template to request specific budget.

In addition, the SOPC would appreciate to understand whether there is an envelope in the Draft Budget reserved to cover the ABRs and – if not – how and to what extent the additional budget requests will be funded.

Metrics and Nomcom

A positive example with respect to development of metrics relates to the support function of the NomCom. It is the understanding of the SOPC that the metrics include such items as the number of applications, the diversity of applications, an assessment of whether the criteria have been met in full (at an organizational not individual level), the timeliness and quality of the process. The report from NomCom is a starting point in developing and reporting on suitable metrics.

Annex A - Background material

SOPC and ccNSO background workshops at ICANN 78

The comments above are based on the preparatory work done by SOPC and ccTLD managers to identify ccNSO priorities and topics of most interest: SOPC conducted a review and prioritization workshop at ICANN 78 in Hamburg on 22 October 2023. This workshop identified a priority ranking for the 11 Operating Initiatives (OI). SOPC members priorities are:

1. Multistakeholder Model
2. DNS improvement & DNS Evolution, Root-Zone management
4. Community decision making process
5. Domain names market drivers & Funding

At a separate workshop with ccNSO WG chairs and Council on Saturday, 21 of October 2023 (ICANN78) the following as important topics relevant to SOPC review were identified:

- WSIS+20 and the Global Digital Compact
- WSIS+20 and continued government support for the multistakeholder model
- Capacity building
- More ccTLD's active participation in ICANN
- Involvement and capacity building
- Outreach budget

A further opportunity to discuss ccNSO priorities and initiatives was the World Café event also at ICANN 78 during which 5 topics were discussed in three rounds:
- The value of the ccNSO to ccTLDS
- ccNSO relevance to the wider ICANN community
- Collaboration, Engagement and Community
- Trust and Credibility
- Cross community involvement

The discussions at this event also support ccNSO interest and priorities to build a broader base of participation by ccTLD managers in ICANN processes, for ccTLDs to be more actively engaged across the community, and to commit to increasing diversity among ccTLD manager participants at ICANN.