
MICHELLE DESMYTER:

Welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Operations, Finance, and Budget Working Group call on Thursday 2nd February 2023. On today's call on the English Channel, we currently have Holly Raiche, Alfredo Calderon, Aziz Hilali, Bill Jouris, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Judith Hellerstein, Marita Moll, Sivasubramanian Muthasamy is now joining, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Holmquist, Sebastien Bachollet, we have Aziz on the French channel, and we have received no apologies.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Michelle DeSymter, on call management. Our Spanish interpreters today are Lilian and Paula, and our French interpreters are Claire and Jacques. A friendly reminder, please state your name before speaking and please speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters today. And with this, I'll turn the meeting back over to you, Holly, please begin.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you very much, Michelle, and good morning. The first item is the action items. Could we have a look at the action items, please? A lot of these have to do with simply the comments that are made. We can just go through this very briefly. The first was a comment that I made -- and I would like to acknowledge that a lot of people have made comments, and I'm very grateful.

This first action item was simply a reflection that I made on the organization and how people might approach looking at the budget. Actually, that's the first three. The other four comments are really

comments about the budget itself. And these are, as I haven't had a look through, reflected in the comments.

So in fact, the first two items are done in the sense that we are now completing the comments phase and the action items that are listed are reflected in the item itself. I will have a look at the action item on transparency again and see if that's reflected. And the next two action items, Michael and Cheryl are to work together on transparency issues. Cheryl, do you want to put something in chat, or have you worked with Michael on the transparency issue?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to respond. Michael and I have not managed to get together yet, but like all things, it will come to pass.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, fine. Why don't we leave those two items -- actually, let's leave the three items on transparency on the agenda as not completed. When we get down to the action item for members to review the top five initiatives, automatically, that's complete because all the members have commented. The items that members begin discussions with can be ticked off too. The ones remaining are on transparency. Thank you.

Could we go to the next item, please? The primary item today is the comments on the operating and financial planning draft, FY24 operating plan, and budget. I'm not going to comment on that because -- which I'm sure all of you have done, is look at the document in the Google doc. Everybody's been sent the link, I think about three times, at least. I'm

very happy with the number of comments and the quality of comments, which are very good. I'll be looking at them, and Chantelle is offering very kindly to help me edit them.

Ricardo, I'll also maybe work with you if we can review the comments themselves. But at this stage, is there anybody who would like to make any final comments on either the FY24-28 Operating and Financial Plan or the draft FY24 Operating Plan and Budget, which is where the operating initiatives and budgetary figures are? Is there anybody who wants to make any final comments that could be incorporated into the budget? Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL:

I'm just a little confused, Holly, in using the word "final" here. I think this thing is open until February 13th. We have not, as far as I know, spoken about how we might comment on the operating initiatives for which I have a presentation and some suggestions today. Would you like to expand on that a bit? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I would be happy to. I sent around an email to remind people. The date that's listed is February 15th, however, for us, today was to be the last day. There needs to be time to look at the document, edit it, and then have a vote. The vote is supposed to start on February 10th. So there is a very limited opportunity. Put your comments in, but we have to allow a few days to look at and edit the budget before it goes to the vote. So there is a final, in terms of ALAC processes and then there is a final in terms of ICANN processes.

The final document for ALAC was today. I actually put that in an email, which, obviously, you didn't get. And I'm really sorry about that. So there is a very limited opportunity, particularly for you, but I would say get your comments in as soon as possible, simply because the editing process must begin. And then the process of voting, we have to allow time for ALAC to vote. Does that assist?

MARITA MOLL:

Thanks, Holly. I have already put a lot of things in. I didn't see the activity of a lot of other people there. I have some other things I will add after this presentation, depending on how the discussion goes. Because I just put them in the cold, not having spoken to the community about these types of things. Let's just move ahead. I think we can do this. That's it. I haven't seen a whole lot of comments going on on the Google doc and I was looking at it two days ago.

HOLLY RAICHE:

We will accommodate new comments. But the problem is we do have to have time, both for editing the comments and for voting. And people have to have time to look at the document before they vote. That's the reason. But we'll work around that, okay? We'll make sure that you have an opportunity for further comment. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

There was only one Google doc for those two things you mentioned, right? I just wanted to make sure.

HOLLY RAICHE: In fact, the Google doc is for the suite of documents that were commented on. And if you look at Ricardo's comment, for example, he does reference the two main documents. So, yes, the comment page is for all of the documents. If there are no other comments or questions, we can move to the next item which is the Improved GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charter Amendment. Cheryl, have you had a look at these?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I've had a look at these.

HOLLY RAICHE: Is your view that we should be commenting on them? My recollection is that we aren't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My recommendation is, absolutely, that we did not.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, well, the open public comments, the note against the GNSO Charter Revision is that we've come to a decision -- and it was an earlier meeting that we've come to the decision -- that in fact, we have not [inaudible - 00:10:42] very long ago, shortly, and literally, around the time they became public comments. Yep, indeed. Now, Ricardo, if you want to go through the draft statement and some of your comments, then we can go through Marita's presentation. And I've already had a

quick look at the next steps, but I'll review them. Ricardo, do you want to talk a little bit about your comments, please? Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

Hello, Holly, thank you very much. Here are some of the comments I made for the last FY24-28 financial plan. The first thing is FY24 is the first year since maybe ICANN's creation that you see a planned decrease in the income of ICANN. But from then on the FY25-28, again, you expect to grow at the same pace as you're growing in the last year. I don't think this is totally realistic. This is my particular point of view.

Since this is the first time in ICANN's creation you see not only a deceleration but a decrease in income. And not even during COVID there was a decrease in income or a planned decrease in income. And then you're planning to grow it again, and I don't see this growth happening with all that's happening in the DNS world and the Internet work. That's the first thing.

The second thing is, once you're saying that you're going to grow again at the same pace that you were planning to grow in the last five years, increasing salaries according to inflation because inflation is now hitting hard in most countries, but then you said you're going to decrease professional services, you're going to decrease administration costs, you're going to decrease some other things although you increase this in the last year.

So it doesn't seem feasible. You're planning for an increase in the number of things like check and balance, you're just putting numbers there. You have an income of 10 so you need to increase salaries so you

decide that you're going to take down the rest of the numbers. Again, I don't think these to be too realistic. These are the two concerns for FY24-28. Do you have any questions?

HOLLY RAICHE:

When you're saying it's a check and balance, what you mean from the way you've explained it here is that it doesn't seem to be a check and balance. On the one hand, you haven't taken into account travel, which is a bit surprising. Because travel costs are now rising. And the services and administrative costs are decreasing.

So it's not really a check and balance number, it's that it just doesn't make sense the way you explained it, which is excellent. I'm just wondering if we could possibly reword that a little bit to make the point that you've just made, which is, this doesn't make sense -- which is actually well explained. Am I correct in that?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

Yes. When I mentioned check and balance, I'm sorry, that was a kind of financial explanation there. If you have 10 and you have to accommodate these 10, what do you do? "I'm going to increase it, I'm going to decrease it." It doesn't make sense.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, good. Thank you for that. Go ahead, please.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I have Judith's hand.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I put the comment down. Thanks, Sylvia, for getting the comments answered. I asked the question about travel. So as she responded in the email, I put down in the comments that the reason why the travel numbers are not decreasing, even though there are higher costs, is that they said that they are decreasing the staff who are going to non-public meetings who are in there.

And so as a result of that, just like you say you're checking your balance, they're keeping the travel at the same level but they're decreasing other costs in the travel. They're going to have less people going to non-ICANN meetings. So that's how they're going to reduce travel, and that's what they sent out in the comments. So I think we need to address that because they actually commented back on that.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I do see the comments they made to you, the other two questions made by other people in their first comments. And they say they are going to decrease professional service, they're going to decrease travel costs, and they're going to decrease administration costs. They are going to reduce these costs, they're going to adjust most of the administrative costs.

And, again, you have been doing this for the last five years. You're augmenting them, you're increasing them. I don't think this will be feasible in the future. And I'm just mentioning it because I think it's important, but this is for me, this is growth. If you think this is not

important, we can delete this. It's not the first time I deleted a comment.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Ricardo. And clearly, this needs to be reworded and rethought. You and I can discuss this later. Let's move on with the rest of the comments.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

For the FY24 budget my comments are for both the funds you have under management, and you have several funds there. Now you're having people that are related to these different funds. There are funds that are different, like option-related funds. There are different funds, so you are now taking this option for new gTLDs from 2012. You're taking these to make grants because that was the decision. And you need people to evaluate the rounds and all the things.

So you're hiring people, and you're hiring people based on these funds. And then you have the FTE funds that are not a different fund than the operational fund. So now you're having people that are not in ICANN org itself, FTE, and you're having people for [inaudible - 00:20:24], you're having people for new gTLD rounds.

So you're having from 390, more or less, FTEs two years ago. You're increasing that to almost 430. So it's about 40 people, they're increasing in FTEs. And now they're saying you're 20 people for something, five people for another -- kind of confusing here with the FTE right now.

The other things are like the cost of the speaker and the cost of the grant, the auction proceeds fund seems to be too high. It says something like \$4 million going to costs. So for a seeker, it's a fund of only \$20 million and you're going to use \$4 million just for administration costs. It sounds like too much. The grant, largest is about \$200 million. You're going to adjudicate only \$20 million a year, and you're going to spend about \$4 million to give this grant of \$20 million. So again, it sounds like too much. Sorry, I didn't enter in the last two or three days. The last time I entered was on the weekend, and I didn't see any of these comments there. Sorry for that.

I already spoke about two things: one is the costs of the funds, the speaker and the grant, and the FTEs that are increasing. Again, although the incomes are decreasing, the FTE is increasing. I know that we asked for more people everywhere but we have to adjust to the reality that the incomes are going down.

So we have to do our balances at some point. These are for the FY24 budget. I don't know if you have any comments there, other than the one for Marita. Yes. I understood at the beginning that though it was for \$4 million for the first time and then it will be \$2 million, in the explanation they made in another table it was \$4 million at the beginning and then \$4 million again. So it's kind of confusing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Ricardo. I understood this is the startup or frontloading costs and I was not either surprised or concerned about that required allocation. But I think we need to be cautious about how we word these

comments because there's a difference between a request for a more easily understood explanation of an action we are not disagreeing with and what could be taken as criticism of the action.

And I'm very aware that with hysterical knee-jerk reactions which we're seeing from the Board -- and yes, I know, that's recorded -- Boards in the past, we've ended up with the freezes on FTEs and all sorts of things, which have been a huge disadvantage to communities. So I'm very cautious about wording what really should be requests for clarification and more easily understood details, which I'm certainly supportive of, and just to make sure that it cannot be read as a criticism of the action.

Because we do, for example, need entirely new, and indeed newly-trained and newly-skilled and differently-skilled staff, and therefore, FTEs for aspects of a new round of gTLDs in the future. And of course, that is not a cost center as such, because they are a cost-neutral activity. But the costs need to be front-loaded, in other words, they need to be taken care of in the setting up of the program noting that the fees paid into the program then cover those costs. I want to be really cautious, can what we write be taken the wrong way?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Cheryl, thank you for that comment. Could you put some of those comments in this Google doc when your concerns are particularly raised? That would be really helpful to both Ricardo and myself. And thank you for the comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can, but it won't be in the next 32 hours.

HOLLY RAICHE: I expect that. Yes. You were in Canberra and I was in Canberra last night. But I think the new cutoff date I'm going to make is Sunday, everybody's time. That will still give us a few days. Heidi, if you could note that although the actual schedule does say this is the end day for comments to be made? I'd like to extend that by a couple of days.

Because clearly, my email was not received by some people, and I would like to give people a couple more days. But we really do have to make Sunday the close-off because we must have time to edit this document before it goes for a vote. And in that time, Cheryl, I would very much appreciate it if you and everybody else could make their comments. Thank you. Go ahead, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Cherry, I understand your comment. I understood this to be moderate. I'm not criticizing, I'm just mentioning that it's increasing something and you're decreasing something. I'm just saying because your incomes are decreasing and this is increasing. That's the point there. But the idea here, again, is to make these collaborative. If we need to delete these comments, whatever you prefer. I don't have any problem with that. And that's the idea of this discussion.

And finally, the next page. This is not being properly [inaudible - 00:29:15] so far because we need Marita -- if anyone else wants to talk about the operating initiative -- where it says, "Support the evolution of

the strengthening of the root server.” Every [inaudible - 00:29:38] has a line of consideration at the end. And I was really concerned about the considerations for root zone management. The ones that are in italics are the considerations made by ICANN org in the budget, they are not mine. What is mine is at the end where it says, “All these considerations rely heavily on the IANA PTI budget.”

We made a comment there that we need to take care of the people. That's what I am trying to replicate here, that we need to have skilled personnel in the IANA PTI and the management of the root zone and to take care of these people being properly paid and maintain it over the years so these considerations by ICANN don't become a reality in the future. That's it. That's the only one I made. I don't know if there's another operation initiative.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Ricardo, I'm glad you identified that the italics are from there. And what we probably need is simply a footnote to say this is where we got the comments. So that was a very helpful comment on your part. Thank you. I'm certainly going to review this. But again, as we've extended the time period, the time to go through this will probably be Monday after people have had a final opportunity to make any further comments. But your explanation of those italics was very useful and probably should be included in the comments themselves. Do you have anything else to say, Ricardo, or can we move to Marita and her presentation?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

No, please go ahead with Marita's presentation. I'm done here.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you for both the work you did and for your presentation just now. Marita, do you want to go ahead, please?

MARITA MOLL: Thanks very much. This is a presentation I put together after looking at the operating initiatives and functional activities in the budget. I didn't look at the numbers, I'll leave that to Ricardo. The operating initiatives that ended up, for me anyway, I thought were things that we might want to comment on were the -- Ricardo put one in that I hadn't included, but I also did facilitate the domain name ecosystem improvement, evolve and strengthen` the multi-stakeholder model, evolve and strengthen ICANN community's decision-making process, then there's something on geopolitical monitoring.

And I have put a lot of text already into the Google doc. As I was writing, I was throwing text in, and some of this presentation is just a summary of some of that text. I see people have already modified my quick writing there. Judith, you already cleaned up one of my sentences.

Let's go to the next slide. As I said, I did want to put in something in the operating initiative called Facilitate DNS Ecosystem Improvements. And I thought it would be a good idea to recognize the inclusion of this one as an operating initiative, as it was not one of these last year. This is how the system goes through its trend analysis and figures out what things you should be focusing on.

A lot of this had to do with mitigating DNS abuse and setting up systems to do that. So I thought that it would be nice of us to recognize if they have done that, especially since we're the group that has been raising this issue most loudly. And perhaps other people would want to jump in and add some things. I'm not an expert on this particular aspect. Holly, were you saying something?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I was, actually. I'm totally in favor of what you were saying. I think it is terrific that you spotted this because DNS abuse has been one of the things that we've been harping on for years. So I think it's excellent to recognize it finally made it into the budget. So I'm smiling and very happy at your comment.

MARITA MOLL:

And I invite anybody else who wants to really look at that section and see if there are things that could be improved in what they're proposing. That's not my area so I'll leave that to everybody else. But I have put that recognition thing in there already.

The next area of interest was to evolve and strengthen the multi-stakeholder model to facilitate diverse and inclusive participation in policymaking. Yes, that was there last year. As I read through this, I zoned in on three things that they seem to be focusing on. And these were three particular issues that had come out of the community discussions that we had two years ago and that famous paper, the 2nd October 2020, increasing the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder

model. These are the three I have focused on. Yes, Brian Cute. That's right, Judith. That's the one.

Under the roles and responsibilities of the ICANN Board, organization, and community, which is one of the issues, one of the MSM issues that came out of the exercise with Brian Cute. That is not exactly what this operating initiative section is calling it but that's what I call it because that is what the issue was called in the original exercise. They did recognize it by putting in the scope a bit about the holistic review, which is coming up. And what's in italics there is what it says in the document. This is the scope, "The holistic review enjoys a high priority status in the community." That's what it says. And I thought we should express our agreement with this and our desire to see that work begin.

Also in the scope, under this particular topic, "We had evolving and enhancing community governance, including revisions to constituency and stakeholder group charters and improvements to election processes." I did not say anything about that in particular but someone else might want to take a look at that and see if there are things that should be said. Now, I'm just putting a little flag on that to say, maybe there's something I haven't thought of that could be said there. Cheryl, do you want to jump in now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Now's my jumping in time. I think what's important here as well, is the opportunity to -- yes, I agree totally with Marita that we should do some sort of [inaudible - 00:38:32] holistic review. We may or may not want to say that it is also an ideal opportunity, as there are aspects of senior

management changing. And with all change, there is an opportunity for such reviews. We started having to call things ICANN org when our last CEO came in, and when their next one is in there might be a slightly different flavor of how we look at things again.

So this is a highly opportune time, going hand in glove with community input into a holistic review. But I did want to talk a little about the aspects of those charter and election processes. That really comes in under the Work Stream 2 recommendations. And to that end, the recent assessment of where the various ACs and SOs and their constituency parts are up to in that is being reported and is being progressed, but it's being done in that container of Work Stream 2, and the work of the prioritization of those recommendations.

So, possibly just a comment recognizing that. Because it is being done, that's why public comments are out at the moment regarding changing of charters. And those changes of charters are often improvements to the election process. So the work is being done, I think we should recognize that's the work being done but it's living under those Work Stream 2 aspects of the evolution process. Does that make sense, Marita?

MARITA MOLL:

Cheryl, I get that, and we can certainly throw that in. Let's go to the next slide, please. On the prioritization one, again, I just wanted to point out in the document that we have had a team addressing these issues from our perspective. And at the same time, our team has been engaging in community-wide discussions.

Now, I'm not the one who's doing that so there may be another couple of lines that could go in there with that. So I'm, again, flagging this area. I had just put in a little note about the fact that we have been doing this for some time.

The next one has more content in it. This is the one about complexity. I noticed as I was going through the pages that there was an increasing discussion about the complexity of the work that's being done. I don't recall seeing that being highlighted as much as I see it this time. It's not only in this particular MSM, it's in the next one as well. It's coming up. It's clearly something that was highlighted as a concern to the people who were preparing this document.

There's one way that is expressed, the need for participants in the policy process to have the requisite expertise and experience can result in less diverse participation. Well, that's one of their considerations. I thought we could say under this section that they need to address this complexity issue more broadly, then maybe have [inaudible - 00:42:50] look at it differently and shake it a little bit out of the box.

The next slide. On this, I had a couple of suggestions. And maybe other people have other suggestions but I thought we could explore different ways to recognize and incentivize volunteers, especially those who have the extensive knowledge base that we really need to hang on to while doing this work. Because you just can't reproduce that in a year or two.

So in order to encourage that continued participation, that's one way of addressing the complexity issue, in keeping people who have a good knowledge base. And I don't really see any place in ICANN where that is

being done. We concentrate on bringing in new people. That is, of course, really important. But I think this is also important. So was one suggestion I was making.

And the other one was to support and recognize outside learning experiences like the schools of internet governance, which do give the people who attend it a very broad base look at the complexity of the issue in ICANN and outside of ICANN. You do have to know a little more about the ecosystem than exactly what goes on in one particular group. So was another comment that I wanted to make.

And if people have other comments about ways ICANN can think outside of the box in order to address the complexity issues, I think that would be great. Because I really think that's what's needed here. They're clearly noticing and realizing that this is complex, it's getting more complex, and it's not possible to make it less complex, so we have to figure out ways to address it.

Let's go to the next slide. Also, on this particular initiative, there is a pilot policy transition program to provide fellows and newcomers with specific knowledge about policy issues using subject matter experts. This, I guess, is new. And great, indeed. But I thought maybe we could ensure that all participants were exposed to those kinds of programs and that those programs were delivered in a way that expressed all kinds of points of view. Now, there's always a danger of delivering it looking only at one point of view. So that was my suggested comment on there. Go ahead, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I put in some comments to that in the Google doc that you wrote on that. But my comment is on the wording. It seems like it's the whole document where you're using the term volunteers. Is it volunteers or participants? I think we need to have some understanding of what verbiage we're going to use.

HOLLY RAICHE: Judith, let me intervene here. I think that's a good point, I would suggest you put that comment in the document as just an editorial one. I think the point that many people are making is that we are volunteers, we are not paid staff. We can make that point, and have made it before. We can continue to make it. But I think you're right. There may be another term. I can understand the use of the volunteers to continue to make the point that, in fact, everybody's doing this on their own time.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right, I know, but maybe we should also check with Jonathan to see if he has a better term.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's fine. That's a good suggestion. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So maybe staff can put that as an action item to talk to Jonathan and see what his thoughts are on the term.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll do that, or do you want to check with him?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You could check with him, I'm traveling this weekend.

HOLLY RAICHE: An action item, I need to do that. That's a good suggestion. Thank you.
Marita, go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Yes, I agree. The participants in this particular thing are obviously volunteers. And if we want to call them that then we can. And we do need to keep on pointing that out.

Next slide, please. The next operating list I looked at is called Evolve and Strengthen the ICANN Community's Decision-Making Process to ensure effective and efficient policymaking. In this one, it is suggested that implementing training and research opportunities for interested staff could improve writing and analytical skills to support the development of community policy recommendations. So I was thinking we would support this, but suggest that also volunteers can have such opportunities. Because we're also doing that work to some extent. So, that was a possible comment.

Next slide. And here, there was a consideration. "The lack of robust data collection today means that data-driven policy work has become difficult and time-consuming and decisions may be made based on anecdotal rather than comprehensive factual evidence." We would

agree with the need for more consistent academic quality policy research. I think that this is something we want to agree with.

I also, in the text that I put in, pointed out that we already saw evidence of this not happening and the data being collected on the consensus playbook through Zoom holds, and it was totally inappropriate. This is not comprehensive academic consistent quality policy research. So we may want to leave that in or take it out. I'll leave it up to the commenters to make that decision. But I think everybody would want to agree with that more, consistent and academic quality policy research.

Next slide, please. So that was it for that section. If anybody sees any more stuff, just please pop it in. I did go a little further in the document and took a look at the geopolitical monitoring initiative and I saw there one of the constraints, "The possibility of forging an alliance with an organization that takes a contrary position to ICANN on a common issue."

This clearly is something that can and will and does happen. And so, not wanting to let that go completely unnoted, maybe we want to think about putting in something about how there can be some accountability when this happens, compromises can be monitored, and how the community is involved.

Then there was also, "The potential perception of some in the community that reassignment of work may lead to a change in funding or reducing participation in events from the level to which the community previously has become accustomed." Well, that's an

interesting statement. And, again, I thought we shouldn't just let it lie there, that maybe we should have something in there saying, well, perhaps there's a way that the community couldn't be involved when such decisions are made. So, some form of accountability.

Next slide. Again, this is the same idea of accountability. And I just wanted to put a marker there saying, well, how is this going to work in the multistakeholder model? Because talking behind closed doors, we try not to do very much about that. But I sometimes see it on the world level, this is what happens. So we need to think about that. Take a look at what I put in and see whether or not people agree with saying something about this.

Next slide, please. Policy Development and Advice Under Resources. This is under functional activities. And this is about the professional staff stuff that we were talking about earlier. Basically, it says, "professional services" -- and I read this to mean contracting out, yep. And we have, in the past, put in a thing that says we know that professional services are necessary but we like to use staff when we can. Sort of minimizing the use of professional services. That's one possibility of maybe responding to that. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think this one's a little bit dangerous, the use of certain professional services that are at arm's length. Yes, experience from staff is essential for some aspects, particularly in the accountability areas. With the concept, for example, of running a holistic review about an organization which would include the structure and the function of an organization

upon which the employment of FTEs is reliant, being done and started by staff that are reliant on the structure staying the same is folly. You really need to have professional services and contractors brought in as need be. It is a very robust system. I've worked with the organization to do it in several circumstances in the past.

And the other risk is, many of the people we think of as our staff are, in fact, contractors. And if I was a mean and nasty chief in an operations area and I needed to reduce my budget from Allocation A because I wanted to put it into Allocation B, that sort of comment would allow me to put the big red in straight through a whole lot of people that [CROSSTALK].

HOLLY RAICHE:

Cheryl, are you almost finished? It's about three minutes to and I would like to say --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes, I have another call at the top of the hour.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

And I wanted to make a quick statement. The people that ICANN uses for the meetings are the same people, those contractors, and so they only sign up for those times. And they are also what they're talking about as professional services, who are the same people we use each time.

HOLLY RAICHE: All right. Judith, if you have anything further to say could you please put that in the Google Doc? I'd like Marita to finish, please.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, the fact of the matter is, this is not in the Google doc yet, and so, I will put it in. I appreciate all the comments on that. Let's have the next slide, which I think is the last one.

This is about monitoring and reporting developments that happen at international forums. I was looking at the wording of this, which is monitor and report on developments and I thought that that sounds pretty passive. I haven't put this in the document yet either, to say that maybe we'll have to, with careful positioning, take a little more active role where that is possible. It's not always possible.

I know this is really complex stuff but I thought that roles need to go beyond monitoring and reporting if possible. And as I'm already part of a public forum that's going to talk about what's this plus 20, we're already doing this in the community by bringing this up and talking about it and seeing what ICANN's rule might be. But I thought we could put that also in our comments under this particular section. That's the last slide.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Marita, I look forward to all of that. Do we have an extra five minutes, Michelle?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: I don't see any issue with that. We have four interpreters so let me just make sure that that is okay. Go ahead and continue on, I'll let you via chat.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's just to close the meeting, but to say, first of all, Marita, please put your comments in the Google doc. As a reminder for people who have any further comments to make, this presentation with the slides will be on this meeting page and can be accessed. This is a reminder that we have revised, we have changed the date.

Now, Cheryl would have liked it to be Monday, close of business. I would like the meeting as soon as possible, just to give time. Because the absolute drop-dead deadline for any comments is the 10th, and we need at least a few days before the 10th to go through and edit the document. So, as soon as possible. I was interested in the session to be held Sunday, March 12th. This is Cancun, and Ricardo is working with staff on that.

Any other business before I close this meeting? At this stage, I don't want to schedule another meeting because I want to get my head across exactly -- we've now finished the complete cycle of our work. And the work of this group will start again as soon as the ICANN Planning -- usually in the next week or a couple of weeks -- we'll start with the next planning cycle. And we have to work with them to see what their deadlines are before we can set the next date. So we're not going to schedule another meeting until there's been some consultation with ICANN Planning.

So with that, are there any other comments or questions? And if not, may I please remind everybody, as soon as possible, to make any final comments because we must vote on this by the 10th of February. All comments must be reviewed, and in, well before then. With no other comments, I would like to particularly thank Ricardo and particularly thank Marita. You've both done a fantastic job. Thank you very much, and have a good day, everybody. Ricardo, do you have any further comments?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: No. I'm waiting for you to check whatever we need to recheck on the comments.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to be reaching out to you. And Marita, I'll be reaching out to you. And thank you everybody for your time. Bye.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you so much, everyone. The meeting is adjourned. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]