

## **Feedback from members on the draft business plan 2011/12**

1. These comments have been collated from members' discussions at meetings in Wellington on 23rd February 2011 and in Auckland on 24th February 2011.
2. 14 people (6 members, 6 staff, 2 Councillors) attended the Wellington meeting while 9 people (4 members, 4 staff, 1 Councillor) attending the Auckland meeting. Two people provided comments by email.

### **Medium-term strategic priorities**

1. The medium-term strategic priorities are for InternetNZ and its subsidiaries while the draft business plan is for InternetNZ alone. This does not come across clearly in the document and it is preferable to have two separate documents.
2. There is some confusion over the terms and intent of "brand" and "brand architecture". Vikram noted that this strategic priority will be undertaken jointly by InternetNZ, DNCL, and NZRS and many of the issues raised are part of the work to be done. In the initial stages, the work is developing a common vision, values, etc. across the three organisations rather visual elements such as organisation logos.
3. Don't take for granted that members have read all previous planning documents or are familiar with the terminology used. Repeat key elements in the document, such as InternetNZ's objects and "sibling" organisations.
4. A member suggested that "measures of success" are short on detail and that a new measure should be added - the .nz wholesale fee continues to drop over time and does not increase. Frank noted this is already existing policy, explaining the process for the setting of the wholesale .nz fee. Others noted that this is a part of a wider financial strategy discussion.

### **Draft business plan**

1. Concern was expressed at the lack of detail in the draft business plan and some members questioned whether it should be termed as a business plan at all. Other members supported the draft business plan as a sound document and a good reflection of the strategy discussions held to-date. It indicates that InternetNZ is heading in the right direction. Members prefer a high level view so that they could easily determine and focus on the proposed new activities.
2. There is a need to provide more detail about "business as usual" activities that are currently excluded from the draft business plan. In particular, more details about the grants process, international engagement, and Group financials. This will have the additional benefit of allowing members to weigh up the proportion of the reactive and proactive work done by the Policy Office.

3. A member was concerned that the business plan had a tone of “unease” and “defensiveness”, in particular around grants. There is also concern that sometimes InternetNZ fails to capitalise on grants funded. Frank sketched out the history of the money and funding question, also noting that the Group Strategy Day identified the need for InternetNZ to be better and more widely understood.
4. Concern that the wider community section is too modest and that InternetNZ needs to “look outside Wellington”. A member suggested that InternetNZ should do a road show, targeting regional New Zealand.
5. General point that much of the discussions had been about communication, particularly the need to better communicate with members. Better summaries of “everything that is happening across the Group” are needed.
6. Discussion about engagement with Parliamentarians and whether InternetNZ is a sufficient influencer politically. Jordan outlined the history of the Parliamentary Internet Caucus and noted we need to re-engage as outlined in the business plan. It was felt that Parliament ought to be concerned about the status and growth of the Internet and that a Councillor should engage with a senior MP outside of Cabinet.
7. Regarding measuring the worth of the Internet, it was noted that the business plan does not have a planned piece of work on measuring the social value of the Internet.
8. There was discussion about membership numbers and how to involve members more. The lack of member participation in the Wellington and Auckland meetings were highlighted as a symptom of the issues. At the same time, it was noted that InternetNZ has a solid core of non-active members that are expected to be vocal if they believe there are some serious issues. Members will involve themselves in things they're interested in. The challenge for InternetNZ is to engage with them in an interesting way on interesting topics. For example, to hold more informal members’ meetings (beer, pizza, good speakers). The GBK meeting in Auckland went very well, with 15 people attending, and could be modelled on that.
9. The weakness is not necessarily the number of members but lack of full Internet community representation. As per the business plan, this year InternetNZ will look at the areas of under-representation and engage with these on a per-segment basis. It was suggested that engaging with other groups who represent the gaps (such as SMEs, web developers, cabling companies) may be a better or additional approach.
10. Some concern was expressed that InternetNZ doesn’t have a ‘shop-front’ and doesn’t have much recognition from the general public. Some members thought InternetNZ needed to raise its profile amongst the general public. Frank noted that InternetNZ does want a high-profile as goal in itself but rather to be known for well-researched, well-thought out leadership positions.

11. The price for registration to NetHui was discussed with many members in favour of reducing it. InternetNZ should find ways to fully fund it and/or look at ways to reduce costs without losing the basic character and intent of the event. Vikram noted that InternetNZ was committed to helping as many people as possible in terms of subsidising their attendance if they couldn't afford to attend, but many members thought that this was not good enough as it is supposed to be a hui.
12. Questions were asked why InternetNZ intends to focus on Wellington in its local engagement plan. Vikram explained that it was because the City Council wants to work with InternetNZ. It is better to work with people who want to work with us initially so that we can build the experience and credibility necessary to engage with other cities.

### **Other comments**

1. A concern was raised over the adequacy of note-taking at members' consultations. Frank noted that members' meetings are not formally minuted but that a summary of comments and discussions would be sent to members.
2. Concern was also expressed that only a few Councillors were in attendance.
3. Vikram noted that a members meeting had been planned for the first week of March 2011 in Christchurch but it had been cancelled due to the earthquake.
4. There were discussions about InternetNZ making a significant donation to the Christchurch earthquake; in the realm of \$100k - \$500k. The ideas of an immediate donation and a longer-term infrastructure commitment were supported. The donation needs to be made within the scope of InternetNZ's objects as we are a registered charity. Others thought the contribution is best focussed on Internet and communications-related infrastructure, possibly jointly with those already working on the ground. This is a topic to discuss with the membership. \$50k as an immediate donation was suggested; Michael Wallmannsberger to move this with Council, with Frank seconding. In addition, InternetNZ should take a leadership role in advocating for laying fibre as the city's infrastructure is re-built.
5. A member noted that there was no one from DNCL and NZRS at the meetings. He was concerned by the growing silos. Frank noted that it was Council's job to note members' comments regarding the two subsidiaries and then communicate as appropriate with them via their respective Chairs as they were independent companies.
6. A member wanted better ways for members to communicate issues directly with the President and Council and have them discussed.