Attendees:

Lesley Cowley, .uk
Sabine Dolderer, .de
Byron Holland, .ca (Chair)
Staffan Johanson, .se
Roelof Meijer, .nl
Debbie Monahan, .nz
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Oscar Robles, .mx
Pablo Rodriguez, .pr
Giovanni Seppia, .eu
Leonid Todorov, .ru
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

Staff Support:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Gabriella Schittekk, ICANN

Apologies:

Jessica Calvo, .cr
Mathieu Weill, .fr

1) Review of the Proposed Letter to ICANN

- Byron Holland presented his draft letter to ICANN on the Strategic Plan. He outlined that it was mainly expressing disappointment in how the process of providing input to the Strategic Plan had failed, especially as the consultation period was a big part of the Strategic Plan.

The Working Group members were asked for input.

It was suggested that the letter should also ask for a redline version of the new plan, as this had been promised by ICANN.

Byron welcomed further input to be submitted on the email list within the next 24 hours.

- The Working Group members were in strong support of the letter and it was suggested to submit it to ICANN as a ccNSO Council position.
It was decided to present the letter to the ccNSO Community during the members meeting. If it would gain support, it could then be submitted to the Council for approval.

2) Review and Discussion of the Updated Timelines for Submissions

- It was noted that ICANN had extended the timeline just before the beginning of the meeting.

3) Assignment of Action Items (proposed)

- The Working Group members agreed on performing the same kind of team work which had been done during the last years, meaning that the group would be divided into teams, each team drafting comments on a subject from the Strategic Plan. The previous year’s submission would be circulated on the email list, so that new Working Group members could become familiar with the work.

It was suggested that old Working Group members remain with their “team”, whilst new ones were asked to define which group they would like to join. This should be based on each member’s background and expertise on the given subjects.

A list of work items was going to be presented to the group on the following day.

- It was estimated that each team would have about two weeks to work together on their assigned topic; their submissions should be sent to the Chair 10 days before the public comment deadline. The Chair would then make the necessary editing to make it look like one document before final submission.

- It was suggested to copy and paste comments on items in the Strategic Plan, where it was felt that previous input had been ignored. It was also noted that items that the members felt were missing in the Strategic Plan should be highlighted.

4) Kevin Wilson – Discussion and Review of Operating Plan

- Kevin Wilson joined the meeting together with Juan Ojega, new ICANN Controller. Juan ran through the FY2012 Operating Plan development cycle. He underlined that the new process was designed to ensure early input possibilities into the process. New “Request Submission Templates” would also ensure clarity of community requests and would furthermore hold the community accountable for submitting clear requests. The forms would also make it easier for the community to track what happened to their requests. It was clarified that fundamental base expenses on items such as security and resiliency would not require a form – the forms were aimed to encompass requests for additional support services.
• Concern was expressed by Working Group members that the Request Submission Templates would spur community members to ask for much unnecessary additional expenditure.

It was also suggested to create a template for Cost Reductions, where community members could submit requests on what they would wish ICANN to spend less funding on.

Kevin and Juan felt that this type of comments should be submitted by using public comment periods.

It was asked whether there would be “quality checks”, including analyses on whether the received requests are within scope of the ICANN bylaws and how much value they would add overall.

Kevin agreed that it will be important to focus on relevant requests and that this would be a hard task. He still thought that the forms would make the prioritisation process more open and transparent.

It was also asked what would happen to requests that come before the Strategic Plan has been agreed and before it is clear if the budget will fit with the community wishes.

It was explained that such requests would be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

• The group expressed their gratitude to Kevin Wilson for his work and support to the community. It was felt it had been a very positive and constructive work relationship.

5) AOB

• The Working Group Chair noted that he would step down as a Chair of the SOP Working Group, as he would stand as Chair for the Finance Working Group. He nominated Roelof Meijer as new SOP Working Group Chair. The Working Group unanimously approved Roelof’s appointment.

• A vote of thanks was proposed to recognise Byron Holland’s work as SOP Working Group Chair. This was carried by acclamation.