Encourage collaboration between countries of the same region by sharing mutual success and to give the opportunity to community to join Universal Acceptance efforts, addition of technical skills.

Activate the Review of Geographic Regions process to give the opportunity for emerging Review the model to reduce decisions making cycle duration by engaging real and more bottom up Model which will help to reach consensus about new processes in acceptable time period due to the tri party arrangement (ICANN, PTI, VRSN)

Ensure that SO and ACs members are effectively representative of their respective  bottom up Model which will help to reach consensus about new processes in acceptable time period due to the tri party arrangement (ICANN, PTI, VRSN)

The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired state (“the "what") into the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the opening plan.

The goal on planning (now 5.1) and associated outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and its related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The outcomes for the section are work in progress; therefore, no S

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal on planning (now 5.1) and associated outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal on planning (now 5.1) and associated outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and its related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.

The goal and related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Submission #</th>
<th>Commenter Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Change Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ccTLD-Berlin</td>
<td>Seeking clarification in the region where the DNS market outcomes are shown.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN's strategy at the time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ccNSO</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System is not to be coordinated with the RIRs.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ccNSO</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System is not to be coordinated with the RIRs.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ccNSO</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System is not to be coordinated with the RIRs.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>We would like to compliment ICANN for making available clear explanations about the rationale behind each of the five strategic objectives. However, it is less clear how ICANN linked the appropriateness of the proposed Strategic Goals with regards to the Strategic Objective: There is no indication of other goals that may have been consulted, or what criteria determined the goals that have been approved.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Targeted outcomes are a measure of success, not an articulation of specific goals and strategies. The introduction has been enhanced to better introduce the outcomes of targeted outcomes and strategic risks.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>ICANN should be connected for acknowledging a drastically elevated financial component, which necessitates a revision of ICANN’s strategic plan. Equally commendable in ICANN’s readiness to listen to the community and incorporate its input as major components in the strategic document.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>What seems to be missing is a reference to the notion of stewardship.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>The notion of stewardship was already present in the overall vision, “by being the independent, trusted, multi-stakeholder steward of the Internet’s unique identifiers” in the introduction section of the Strategic Plan, we suggest that reference now generally in acting within ICANN’s remit is appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>Further, in the absence of a specific definition of the concept of global public interest it would be difficult to define its usage or have it be accompanied by clearly-defined qualifications.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>ICANN’s role to seek the global public interest is a key aspect of all work done and decisions made. For this paragraph: “define the concept of global public interest” should be modified to “clarify the concept of global public interest”.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>We have no comments regarding ICANN’s mission and find it comprehensive and exhaustive. We also particularly welcome paragraph 1.1. (b) holding that “ICANN shall not act outside its Mission” which this group believes to be essential in the overall mission.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>It seemed important to make sure that an approach is defined, prior to promoting it, hence the addition, rather than a substitution.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 1.2., we suggest inserting the sentence “the single, interoperable Internet is insecure if the withdrawal of DNS data from its root server” should top the list, as it is the greatest and most universal threat of all.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The strategy was focused on clear strategic goals and outcomes to be achieved, not a secondary point.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 1.3., we suggest stating “ICANN is the leader in DNS security and the international governing body” which top the list.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The risk (as modified in the revised draft) reflects that the loss of trust is greater and the impact of the development of alternative DNS root services, which have already been in existence for many years. A loss of trust could destroy the consumer faith in other services that are more malleable/accountable. The risk has been金沙 in this sense.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 1.7., the introduction talks about the root server’s responsibility and its governance. However, Strategy 1.7. (looking closely at the Targeted Outcomes) includes prioritisation as well as processes and representation. Either there is no need for three Objectives (two would suffice), or the wording of the objectives need to be improved to reflect their intended meaning.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to reflect that work done and decisions made.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>The success of the model (participation of all stakeholders can also cause its downfall by triggering possible delays in decision-making and having a high threshold for decisions on controversial issues (i.e. impossible to align the stakes of all stakeholders)).</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to reflect the work done and decisions made.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Goal 1.3., we recommend avoiding phrases such as ‘like DNSSEC within the DNS’ in the Targeted Outcome, as they are excessively particular;</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to reflect the work done and decisions made.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Goal 1.4., we suggest merging the two foremost Targeted Outcomes to read, ‘ICANN, in partnership with DNS stakeholders, and for the all Objective states what needs to be improved, addressed, strengthened, enhanced and sustained, and gives no clue whatsoever to how that will be achieved.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The all Objective states what needs to be improved, addressed, strengthened, enhanced and sustained, and gives no clue whatsoever to how that will be achieved.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>The success of the model (participation of all stakeholders can also cause its downfall by triggering possible delays in decision-making and having a high threshold for decisions on controversial issues (i.e. impossible to align the stakes of all stakeholders)).</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The all Objective states what needs to be improved, addressed, strengthened, enhanced and sustained, and gives no clue whatsoever to how that will be achieved.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>The strategic plan focuses on a desired state (“the “what”). The mission, which this group has advocated at length.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The strategic plan focuses on a desired state (“the “what”).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>We have no comments regarding ICANN’s mission and find it comprehensive and exhaustive. We also particularly welcome paragraph 1.1. (b) holding that “ICANN shall not act outside its Mission” which this group believes to be essential in the overall mission.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 2.3., we suggest inserting the sentence “The reliable, resilient, and interoperable DNS remains the leading trusted platform for the Internet users’.”</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 2.3., we suggest adding the sentence “ICANN’s mission and mission activities must be coordinated with the RIRs”.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 2.3., we suggest adding the sentence “ICANN’s mission and mission activities must be coordinated with the RIRs”.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 2.3., we suggest adding the sentence “ICANN’s mission and mission activities must be coordinated with the RIRs”.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>We have no comments regarding ICANN’s mission and find it comprehensive and exhaustive. We also particularly welcome paragraph 1.1. (b) holding that “ICANN shall not act outside its Mission” which this group believes to be essential in the overall mission.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>For Strategic Goal 2.3., we suggest adding the sentence “ICANN’s mission and mission activities must be coordinated with the RIRs”.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccNSO-GOPC</td>
<td>We have no comments regarding ICANN’s mission and find it comprehensive and exhaustive. We also particularly welcome paragraph 1.1. (b) holding that “ICANN shall not act outside its Mission” which this group believes to be essential in the overall mission.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN’s strategy at this time.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ALAC maintains an incredible portfolio in that Internet end user implications are not restricted just to the GNSO policy development processes but extends to other parts of the ICANN work. We are charged by the bylaws to represent the Internet end users and we carry that load in good faith as best we can. At the Internet end user level, participation in the process requires stamina, technical knowledge and political skills. This is why it is important and otherwise unmet need. One of ICANN’s great strengths lies in the financial support it is able to offer to bring all these resources to the table. Volunteers are bringing vast resources of time and knowledge to the table and the needs also is to be a recognized and valued part of the exchange. We wish to underline the need to be aware of the interdependence invited when we seek to introduce cost efficiencies while protecting the principles of accountability and transparency.

Support
Thank you for your support.

No

The ALAC therefore agrees this should be the primary strategic objective for ICANN and strongly supports the four strategic goals 1.1 to 1.4 as listed in the draft strategic plan.

Support
Thank you for your support.

No

An additional outcome was added under Goal 1.2 to address the comment ("Continued efforts of ICANN organization, community and Board facilitate the inclusion and participation of all stakeholders.")

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No

Support
Thank you for your comment.

No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Issue #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 7 ALAC</td>
<td>The ALAC has reiterated that ICANN is not a regulator.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 7 ALAC</td>
<td>The ALAC has reiterated that ICANN is not a regulator.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 7 ALAC</td>
<td>The ALAC has reiterated that ICANN is not a regulator.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 7 ALAC</td>
<td>The ALAC has reiterated that ICANN is not a regulator.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 8 R/SG</td>
<td>The RySG believes that the best way to achieve solid metrics, reliable financials, and future-oriented planning is to implement a Strategic Plan with clear alignment of the objectives and goals.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 8 R/SG</td>
<td>The RySG believes that the best way to achieve solid metrics, reliable financials, and future-oriented planning is to implement a Strategic Plan with clear alignment of the objectives and goals.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 8 R/SG</td>
<td>The RySG believes that the best way to achieve solid metrics, reliable financials, and future-oriented planning is to implement a Strategic Plan with clear alignment of the objectives and goals.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 8 R/SG</td>
<td>The RySG believes that the best way to achieve solid metrics, reliable financials, and future-oriented planning is to implement a Strategic Plan with clear alignment of the objectives and goals.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 8 R/SG</td>
<td>The RySG believes that the best way to achieve solid metrics, reliable financials, and future-oriented planning is to implement a Strategic Plan with clear alignment of the objectives and goals.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 9 R/SG</td>
<td>The RySG welcomes the ICANN-initiated effort to work with the community to identify the five key trends expected to impact ICANN’s future, mission, and operations and thus use these as a foundation for the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>The GNSO Council recommends adding clarifying language that Supporting Organizations are not required to work towards consensus and mutual gain (as the bottom-up multi-stakeholder model does not operate well when there is continually wasted, or discussion halted, by polarized positions that do not represent the collective interest). The RrSG would like to see ICANN actively working towards minimizing this kind of behaviour and looks forward to the work by GNSO Council on POP 3.0 in the hope that improved processes will do the same.</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the “closed model” adopted by the EPDP as it may achieve better speed and efficiency, but it may sacrifice diversity or inclusivity. How does ICANN intend to achieve the seemingly competing goals of increasing diversity and capacity across all parts of its ecosystem and ensuring that work gets done and policies are developed in an effective and timely manner?</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>The GNSO Council is concerned that there is a danger in privileging ‘effectiveness’ in the policy development processes. We therefore ask that this sentence be revised to read, “Improve the effectiveness of ICANN’s policy development processes”.</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Other suggestion: Compellingly containing goals is the main challenge of the objective on ICANN governance. The perspectives under objective #2 have been edited to make that more apparent.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The RrSG would like to echo our comments submitted on the FY20 budget. ICANN is surrounded by business experts who must get their financial planning right, especially when reporting growth expectations to the market. Conversely, ICANN’s budgeting exercises appear to be carried out in isolation, without community input on their own forecasts until decisions are essentially already made. A balance between income growth and realistic expenditure must be sought and the community must do more to first examine on ICANN’s cash.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>The GNSO Council is concerned that there is a danger in privileging ‘effectiveness’ in the policy development processes. We therefore ask that this sentence be revised to read, “Improve the effectiveness of ICANN’s policy development processes”.</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the “closed model” adopted by the EPDP as it may achieve better speed and efficiency, but it may sacrifice diversity or inclusivity. How does ICANN intend to achieve the seemingly competing goals of increasing diversity and capacity across all parts of its ecosystem and ensuring that work gets done and policies are developed in an effective and timely manner?</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The GNSO Council is concerned that there is a danger in privileging ‘effectiveness’ in the Policy Development Process without concurrently considering inclusivity. We therefore ask that this sentence be revised to read, “Improve the effectiveness of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder policy development processes’.</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>The GNSO Council is concerned that there is a danger in privileging ‘effectiveness’ in the Policy Development Process without concurrently considering inclusivity. We therefore ask that this sentence be revised to read, “Improve the effectiveness of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder policy development processes’.</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>The GNSO Council supports the continued examination of legislation and regulations to ensure that ICANN’s policies and procedures do not unnecessarily restrict the ability of ICANN’s stakeholders to innovate and provide for the safe and secure operation of the Internet.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the “closed model” adopted by the EPDP as it may achieve better speed and efficiency, but it may sacrifice diversity or inclusivity. How does ICANN intend to achieve the seemingly competing goals of increasing diversity and capacity across all parts of its ecosystem and ensuring that work gets done and policies are developed in an effective and timely manner?</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit. Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the objective and have taken our own steps in 2018 and early 2019 to develop &quot;EPDP 2.0 Recommendations&quot; for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Council in managing the GNSO Policy Development Processes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the objective and have taken our own steps in 2018 and early 2019 to develop &quot;EPDP 2.0 Recommendations&quot; for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Council in managing the GNSO Policy Development Processes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the objective and have taken our own steps in 2018 and early 2019 to develop &quot;EPDP 2.0 Recommendations&quot; for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Council in managing the GNSO Policy Development Processes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The GNSO Council endorses the objective and have taken our own steps in 2018 and early 2019 to develop &quot;EPDP 2.0 Recommendations&quot; for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Council in managing the GNSO Policy Development Processes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council requests clarification regarding the intended implementation of the outcome. Without further clarification, we suggest that &quot;new technologies&quot; be inserted to read, &quot;new technologies which directly impact the reliability, stability, and security of the Domain Name System&quot; so as to ensure ICANN stays on mission.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit #86 &amp; #132. Also addressed comment #85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council agrees the Targeted Outcomes and Roles, but can only accept this outcome due to the satisfactory completion of relevant policy development work that is being undertaken. Accordingly, we request that this objective be reordered so as not to presuppose any outcome: &quot;Subject to completion, GMSO Council approval and ICANN Board approval of a Final Report of the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, ICANN will plan a properly funded, managed and implemented expansion of gTLDs.&quot;</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Edited the goal to clarify the strategic intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council supports the objective, particularly market and geopolitical issues they impact GNSO Policy Development Processes and Implementation Review Teams.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Roles, particularly: An enhanced policy process to inform the ongoing or future work of GNSO Policy Development and Implementation processes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Roles. We recognize the value of a deep and informed pool of volunteers that will contribute to GNSO policy development activities.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council supports the objective and recognizes both the cost and value of ICANN's support for GNSO policy development and implementation activities.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>While market trends should be considered in organizational guidance, it should be noted that market trends are only relevant insofar as they: 1) overlap with the current mission of ICANN, 2) as they affect ICANN's stability and resilience, 3) impact ongoing or future Policy Development and Implementation activities, and 4) impact ICANN's stream of revenue.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Roles.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>Draft, the BC agrees with the content of the Plan.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>The BC notes that ICANN is proceeding to amend its Vision statement in this next Strategic Plan. There, the BC wishes to acknowledge the considerable change in ICANN’s strategic intent.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The introduction section of the strategic plan already acknowledges “a renewed vision statement.” Not changes necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>The BC notes that it has not been charged, and supports this decision.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>Regarding Strategies Objectives, the BC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are furnished with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>The GAC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are furnished with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>Revised: Strategic Sect 4 is confusing now. It seems textual and not strategic, and not consistent with the level of input of other points in this section, particularly in light of the weakness of initial new gTLD impacts.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>The numbering of the objectives does not represent any order of priority. The numbering has been minimized. Some numbering was kept, for ease of finding only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>We agree Security is not most important, given the continued abuse of DNS and the resultant lack of trust in, for example, web browsing and email, two globally accessible and pervasive systems built on DNS.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>Rephrasing the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model is clearly a priority. ICANN is rightfully developing a reputation for being slow, combative, and less transparent. Decisions and process in the EPDP are just the latest examples in this regard.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>As to geopolitical issues, ICANN appears at risk of being marginalized by governments and organizations that seek to increase its influence over Internet policy, as evidenced by policies originating from the EU, China, and Russia. If ICANN holy wants to be a Champ’r of the open internet it surely needs to retain or regain its footing on the global stage.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Constituency</td>
<td>Withstanding the opening paragraph in this section, stating a Strategic Objective of financial sustainability requires more detail. One can achieve financial sustainability by increasing revenue or operating more efficiently. But only by the latter will the multi discipline ICANN needs, based on (continuing) structural trends over the 5 years of the prior (current) Strategic Plan. The objective should be re-worded to reflect only Goal 5.2, and possibly 5.3. To this extent, the BC welcomes the &quot;Operating Plan&quot; which the document (once) forthcoming.</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Goals under objective on Finances have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Strategic planning is important to the ICANN organization. The GAC acknowledges the effort of all ICANN communities to participate in this strategic planning effort. The GAC appreciates the specific opportunity afforded to GAC members and observers to contribute to the development phase of the initial draft strategic plan - specifically during ICANN61 in San Juan, Puerto Rico (see: <a href="https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann61/agenda-item-30-strategic-public-domain-activity">https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann61/agenda-item-30-strategic-public-domain-activity</a>).</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>The GAC endorses the objective that ICANN &quot;has a properly funded, managed and implemented expansion of gTLDs.&quot; The Bylaws clearly state that ICANN itself &quot;does not hold any governmental authority or regulatory authority&quot; (see, ICANN Bylaws Section 1.4). The GAC acknowledges that the objective to &quot;explore new, transparent and robust multi-stakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector,&quot; while directly impacting the public policy advice of governments and public authorities (see ICANN Bylaws Section 1.2(a)(x)); Moreover, ICANN's core values obligate the organization in recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and play/legit into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities (see ICANN Bylaws Section 1.2(b)(x)).</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>In reference to ICANN’s commitments and core values was added to the numbers of section 3 on ICANN governance. It is important to note that while the strategic plan supports the Bylaws, it cannot be tied to other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>The GAC acknowledges the framework of the proposed strategic plan that outlines the major strategic goals. Mindful of the commitments to governments in the ICANN Bylaws, the GAC generally supports the draft Strategic Plan’s second objective to: “improve the effectiveness of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model of governance” (see Strategic Objective 2). The following comments focus specifically on the second of the five strategic objectives.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>The GAC agrees that to achieve the second objective, three primary strategic goals should include: 1. Address the increasing needs of inclusivity, accountability and transparency, while at the same time ensuring that work gets done and policies are developed in an effective and timely manner; 2. Strengthen ICANN’s multi-stakeholder decision-making process; and 3. Strengthen the inclusivity and openness of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model by improving and susțaining diverse representation and active, effective participation.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Submission #</td>
<td>Commentor</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>The GAC believes that the second strategic goal would be ill-defined if specifically mentioning the contribution of policy advice in the multistakeholder decision-making process. Thus, in the list of targeted outcomes for strategic goal 2.2, the term &quot;policy advice&quot; should be added.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>The GAC welcomes the draft plan's emphasis on strategic goal 2.3 to improve and sustain the &quot;multistakeholder, active, effective participation&quot;. The GAC is working to achieve improved participation and engagement among contributors to its own committee work. That philosophy was also integrated to the recent joint statements shared with the ICANN Board by the GAC and the At-Large Advisory Committee encouraging the organization to provide additional support to enable effective participation of all ICANN stakeholders. In the first Joint Statement, &quot;Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN,&quot; issued at CCNSG in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017, the two advisory committees urged the Board to incorporate new document management and briefing capabilities to enable non-expert stakeholders to meaningfully participate in ICANN processes and make their voices, their needs and interests heard (see, e.g., <a href="https://gac.icann.org/content/forged/2015-02-09-ccnsg-report">https://gac.icann.org/content/forged/2015-02-09-ccnsg-report</a>). In its reply, the Board referred to the Information Technology Initiative (ITI) launched in January 2018, which will, hopefully, lead to the creation of a document management system that is required by the ACAC and the GAC — all allow, even to non-expert stakeholders, a quick and easy access to ICANN documents. It is important that completion and delivery of the ITI be a featured part of the strategic plan implementation — perhaps deserving of its own specific reference as one of the outcomes of this strategic goal 2.3 or elsewhere in the strategic plan.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Introduction to the Plan: Increased Internet use, greater regulatory activity, the IAAN transitions and many other internal and external factors underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan in the form of a renewed vision statement, as well as new strategic objectives, goals, targeted outcomes, and tasks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Vision: We agree that updating the vision statement (in tables below) post IAAN transition is necessary, but we do require changes in some instances. To be a champion of the open, open, and globally interoperable Internet, by being the independent, trusted, multistakeholder steward of the Internet's unique identifiers, and by providing an open and collaborative environment where shared stakeholders come together in the global public interest to:</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Secure operational excellence of the IAAN Functions;</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Secure operational excellence of the IAAN Functions;</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS Root Server System;</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Enable ITI to be tracked and reported as a separate strategy in the implementation plan.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS Root Server System;</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS Root Server System;</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Secure operational excellence of the IAAN Functions;</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>- Secure operational excellence of the IAAN Functions;</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>We question the value of only mentioning one security issue (DDoS attacks linked to IoT devices on pg. 9) in the opening summary. This paragraph is not necessary in the introduction.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Edited the 2nd paragraph of the narratives under the section #1 on policy advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with revised outcomes and tasks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with outcomes and tasks. Specifically we commend the goal of developing a coordinated emergency plan.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>We feel the first sentence should be updated to reflect the word &quot;Internet&quot; with DNS and unique identifiers system.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft ICANN Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2021 - 2025 | Public comments received and ICANN organization responses, ordered by submissions received in chronological order**
144 15 At-Large Advisor

Support: Need to have additional details on how the accomplishment of the goals will be measured. The AC should ensure that the goals have acceptable summary.

Response: The goals under section #2 on ICANN's governance, and the associated targeted outcomes and risks have been edited to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal. We agree that the PDP 3.0 developments contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in the outcomes under goal 2.1.

Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.

145 14 Other suggestion

Support: Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks will contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in the outcomes under goal 2.1.

Response: We agree that the PDP 3.0 developments contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in the outcomes under goal 2.1.

146 13 Other suggestion

Support: We agree that the PDP 3.0 developments contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in the outcomes under goal 2.1.

Response: We agree that the PDP 3.0 developments contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in the outcomes under goal 2.1.

147 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

148 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

149 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

150 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

151 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

152 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

153 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

154 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

155 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

156 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

157 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

158 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

159 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

160 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

161 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

162 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

163 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

164 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

165 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

166 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

167 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

168 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

169 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

170 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

171 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

172 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

173 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

174 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

175 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

176 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

177 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

178 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

179 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

180 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

181 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

182 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

183 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

184 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

185 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

186 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

187 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

188 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

189 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

190 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

191 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

192 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

193 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

194 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

195 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

196 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

197 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

198 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

199 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

200 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

201 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

202 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

203 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

204 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

205 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

206 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

207 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

208 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

209 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

210 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

211 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

212 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

213 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

214 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

215 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

216 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

217 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

218 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

219 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

220 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

221 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

222 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

223 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

224 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

225 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

226 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

227 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

228 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

229 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

230 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

231 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

232 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

233 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

234 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

235 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

236 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

237 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

238 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

239 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

240 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

241 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

242 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

243 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

244 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

245 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

246 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

247 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

248 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

249 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.

250 13 Other suggestion

Response: Thank you for your comment.
**Comment #** | **Commander** | **Comment** | **Response** | **Change** | **Where**
---|---|---|---|---|---
152 | PS-9 | It’s a positive comment. A very positive one. So I congratulate you for putting the encouragement for IDN implementations, universal acceptance of IDNs, and so on — all of that. So nothing to say. We are full support with that. We are cooperating with that. That’s one of our major, major goals internally as well, to bring that to a positive result. And I would really encourage you to follow with that in mind. And in addition, we are also very interested in being able to help people who are interested in the — the new identifier systems in the IoT environment. And so we heard from Goren that he’s also open as well to — to cooperation with his CDIO — not the CDIO, the tech, CT0 department in that respect. So I think it’s on a good line and I would like to encourage sometimes to come back to that and to encourage you to continue. Thank you. | Support | Thank you for your support | No | p.18
153 | PS-10 | thru the NHG, the Newcomer Resource Organization, watched a contract on behalf of the five RIRs regarding these strategic goals, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. asking that, to the extent that those goals are with respect to Internet number resources that work on them be coordinated with the RIRs. We ask that the comment be considered well within this draft plan. Thank you. | Support, with edits | The rationale on Unique Identifier systems has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective. | Yes | 17
154 | PS-11 | it relates to support the adoption of IDNs. It’s a really challenging topic, even prior to being with Neuster, I was with AusCERT, and they had SHADAKA which was one of the first IDN TLDs that went into the root. There were many challenges because there wasn’t the infrastructure or the support for the TLD from registrars, so what we were looking for was an end-to-end experience for the registrar so that they could register the name with — in Arabic, so the full experience was to be Arabic. One of the other realizations is that there’s not a market for the IDN TLD and it’s difficult to create that market. So it’s — so I’m not really sure if when you’re looking for community input to support the adoption of IDNs, you know, how broad that is or what you’re actually looking for in that regard. But I would also add that, you know, guiding IDNs to one side, one of the challenges of many of the new registry operators — and this is something we’re trying to engage GOAL and the board on a number of occasions — a lack of global awareness of what was a significant expansion of TLDs across the Internet, and it’s global. So I think what we need to be doing, in terms of a consumer awareness campaign, to explain to the global internet community that there are new resources out there and they are safe and people can actually use them and they provide competition in the marketplace that’s something from a security — certainly the registry stakeholder perspective, that’s an area I think absent. So I saw that as part of the effort for the support of adoption of IDNs. There hasn’t been that global awareness campaign at a high level or consumer awareness campaign about one of the biggest expansions of the Internet that we’ve seen in many years. So — and I see that that is directly related to the support and adoption of IDNs. Thans. | Support | Expand the goal to clarify the strategic intent | Yes | p.18
155 | PS-12 | still looking at bullet point 3, it may be the wording that says, but still from all those people who are waiting for the new round of gTLDs to open, I think that should not be a properly funded round but execute. And in terms of round, it should say new rounds. It should not appear that we are only planning one operating in the next five years. Thank you. | Support, with edits | Expand the goal to clarify the strategic intent | Yes | p.18
156 | PS-13 | when we think about the build a worldwide deployment of IPv6. We have seen in the table since many, many years in ICANN and also in its. There was a term “registration” to IPv6. Then, there was term “transition.” But finally in 2018 the word “deployment” was used. However, you need to see collaboration with other organization involved in order to create the countries they want to deploy the IPv6. From technical point of view, there is a lot of work to do, but unfortunately up to now there have been no any tangible reply to that. So they need to have some way of regulatory environment for the countries having the same problems, even for some kind of technical readiness for IPv6 from the viewpoint of the import of the equipment and other materials. I think there should be some way to assist these countries that they will work and they’re eager to have IPv6 but this obstacle does not allow them to do that. This is very important point. I think this is one of the very important elements that ICANN needs to embark on. Thank you. | Other suggestion | The ICANN strategic plan is a global document, not going into regional or local specifics. We encourage you to follow the development of ICANN’s - regional strategic plans. No changes made here. At a regional level, coordinated work with RIRs and regional TLD organizations with capacity development on DNS technical issues. IPv6 is one of the areas of collaboration at a regional level. No | p.18
157 | PS-14 | have a comment for the IDN-related issues. So ICANN standard is a standard — was implemented in 2003. Email internationalization standard was in 2012. So after many many years E — Internet community still feel adoption of IDN and the EAI is very, very low. So how do you plan ICANN to support IDN in real years? That’s of me, thank you very much. Also I think the USG to allow the wish to USG as a bigger platform, affect many Internet-related service providers, (indiscernible) companies to invest in this platform to adopt IDN and the EAI standards. Currently Microsoft and many large local email companies and also many open source already support EAI IDN. But Internet users feel that deployment really is still very low. But very few companies, Internet users, feel companies really use international email address and IDN names. Also, IDN names have been registered — think more than millions of domain names, but the answer resolution is very, very low. So I think maybe next five years ICANN — ICANN Internet community have — find a better solution to make IDN adoption and domain adoption is better. So one thing I think ICANN can do is the ICANN can make it’s IP systems to — information systems to support IDN and EAI. For example, I’m a registrar or register or registrar. I send internationalized email address to ICANN. Can ICANN accept this email address or not? So in the ICANN some web page there are not all of international email address or non-international domain names. So in future, if I want to communicate in ICANN provider, (indiscernible), maybe better, list some Chinese email address or Italian email address, Swedish email address, French email address or that we can easily communicate to ICANN Board, ICANN directors. So last time we have our meeting, USG meeting in Guang Zhou, the India person said IDN should be a new service on 2 billion Internet users to Internet. Thank you very much. | Other suggestion | ICANN’s current roadmap does include ICANN email systems becoming EAI-readiness only, roughly the Jan-Mar 2020 timeframe. EAI-readiness will be achieved in 6 discrete steps. Each will result in ICANN’s email system honoring EAI-readily. Reactions will only be visible when the IPv6 and IPv4 may be taken. The other steps are required as prerequisites to system EAI-readiness. No | p.18
158 | PS-15 | There is a comment for IDN-related issues. So ICANN standard is a standard — was implemented in 2003. Email internationalization standard was in 2012. So after many many years E — Internet community still feel adoption of IDN and the EAI is very, very low. So how do you plan ICANN to support IDN in real years? That’s of me, thank you very much. Also I think the USG to allow the wish to USG as a bigger platform, affect many Internet-related service providers, (indiscernible) companies to invest in this platform to adopt IDN and the EAI standards. Currently Microsoft and many large local email companies and also many open source already support EAI IDN. But Internet users feel that deployment really is still very low. But very few companies, Internet users, feel companies really use international email address and IDN names. Also, IDN names have been registered — think more than millions of domain names, but the answer resolution is very, very low. So I think maybe next five years ICANN — ICANN Internet community have – find a better solution to make IDN adoption and domain adoption is better. So one thing I think ICANN can do is the ICANN can make it’s IP systems to — information systems to support IDN and EAI. For example, I’m a registrar or register or registrar. I send internationalized email address to ICANN. Can ICANN accept this email address or not? So in the ICANN some web page there are not all of international email address or non-international domain names. So in future, if I want to communicate in ICANN provider, (indiscernible), maybe better, list some Chinese email address or Italian email address, Swedish email address, French email address or that we can easily communicate with ICANN Board, ICANN directors. So last time we have our meeting, USG meeting in Guang Zhou, the India person said IDN should be a new service on 2 billion Internet users to Internet. Thank you very much. | Other suggestion | ICANN’s current roadmap does include ICANN email systems becoming EAI-readiness only, roughly the Jan-Mar 2020 timeframe. EAI-readiness will be achieved in 6 discrete steps. Each will result in ICANN’s email system honoring EAI-readily. Reactions will only be visible when the IPv6 and IPv4 may be taken. The other steps are required as prerequisites to system EAI-readiness. No | p.18
159 | PS-16 | It’s looking at the word “fear” — so is a deficit on the word “fear” — this word “fear” may be a bit threatening and I’m wondering if it’s better to say “needs and trends”. There’s a global trend towards privacy, and I don’t think qualifying it as a threat is a good idea for a lot of reasons. So I would suggest changing the word “fear” to “needs” or “opportunities”. | Support | The word “fear” has been replaced with “challenges and opportunities”. | Yes | 22 & 24
160 | PS-17 | with respect to Internet number resources that work on them be coordinated with the regional organizations, including the saying that we have the team from Africa for the last five years. And we have seen some considerable growth on the ground as a result of that. But, again, we need to continue strengthening that. I see that happening in other regions, specifically, with the DNS forum that we have been involved with in one way or the other. So I will just encourage that more support from the ICANN organization, especially to the regional partnerships, to be extended. The second thing is, with regard to collaboration with countries code top-level domain registries, we need more collaboration, especially in the light of best practices. We are having unique challenges in our region. And I’m speaking from the Africa region, where we see increased interest from regulators in country code top-level domain registries. And it’s bringing confusion. I think it’s good for the mix of regulators to be highlighted. And we need help from ICANN, ISO, IETF, be it at 1st level or from whichever source to just highlight what is the best practices. Because I would say in many cases when the mixture becomes a problem, there becomes a problem in the field. There’s always a problem. And so we are seeing directly in that direction in which there is a bit of clarity in the one where the role of ICANN is not clarified, and leave of best practice are not clarified. So I hope this can really be part and parcel of this strategic planning exercise that we are setting in place. | Other suggestion | Encouraging the need for collaboration with ICANN, the ICANN board under 4.2 has been edited to include local partners (not just regional and global). Yes | p.18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission #</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS-14</td>
<td>Various Assists</td>
<td>the point here is that the collaborative work is multi-country. I think I have already collaborated. Perhaps one could say continued collaboration or foster collaboration. If you say collaboration, that means up to now there is no collaboration and you start from scratch. But have you to say you continue collaboration or you foster collaboration in order to give the impression that every effort is made to improve the collaborations.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-15</td>
<td>Nabil Goyal</td>
<td>We are all going to measure ICANN's success on these strategic goals year on year or quarter on quarter to see if we are doing well, good, not so good, and making changes in our operations to know that we are doing better and better quarter on quarter, year on year? Because without a way to measure these, how do we tell to the community that, yes, we have done what we set out to do?</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Progress is tracked through accountability indicators (<a href="https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators">https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators</a>). The plan's introduction has been edited to make that apparent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-16</td>
<td>Roelof Meijer</td>
<td>In the last two minutes, the title slide is, we've come really a long way over the last five years, let's say the last five years. I've been in this group for a bit longer than that. And I would like to compliment ICANN corp on the way that you have designed the process now for both the strategic plan and the five-year operational plan, the way you stick to your process and follow the planning, the way you deal with the comments that you get from the community and incorporate them into the plans, and as a final result, the quality of the plans. So I'm really proud of what you did.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-16</td>
<td>Roelof Meijer</td>
<td>No other comment. If you look at your strategic objectives and your strategic goals, most of them are specified by a web, which I notice that you state an action in most cases and not a result, not an outcome. And I think that kind of refers also to the previous question from the gentleman, how do you measure if you have reached where – if you have arrived where you wanted to go if you take an action and not an end point. So that will be my suggestion. Get through the goals again and see if you could better change some of the wording from an action into a goal, a real goal, so that we know when we've been successful. There's a lot of improve, encourage, understand, plan, evolve without stating the end point.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Several of the goals were rephrased to better reflect a desired end state rather than an activity to perform.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 8 &amp; 9, p. 17, 18, 21, p. 22 &amp; 23, p. 25 to 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-17</td>
<td>Stephanie Perkins</td>
<td>I would like to echo the previous speakers' comments. Thank you thank you very much for the increased effort that we're getting in the budgets. I'd like to encourage you to break them down into smaller pieces yet. I think it will help us measure our productivity, and against the KPIs. And I totally agree also that outcomes are really important. I think we need to develop KPIs and better metrics for measuring our own contributions to ICANN and how well it's working. Hence, this framework to supporting the multi-stakeholder model. Why do you have us hanging around? It's not just to annoy the business community, you know, or to introduce threats like GDPR. So I'm struggling with that, to develop those KPIs and metrics, and we'll love some help. I'm going to be posting the finance folks. But I think that across the board we need improvement in our metrics. It's not just us. But we certainly like to get your help on that.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Progress is tracked through accountability indicators (<a href="https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators">https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators</a>). The plan's introduction has been edited to make that apparent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-16</td>
<td>Mark Cola</td>
<td>I'm going to open my comments by mentioning an experience that perhaps thousands will say remember, I'm not sure any of the ways will, but when ICANN introduced its first strategic plan, it made it all the way to version 19 with no community input at all. And the NGNO – Bruce Tonkin was the chair of the NGNO at the time, and we collected $5,000 and funded a stakeholder-wide review two-day session in Amsterdam, and members of the community, some of whom are here, came and you have to remember there were very few staff at the time. And that was the first real engagement of the community. So look how far we've come. That's my message. And look how seriously we're talking it. But I think we have to be very clear that with the kinds of changes that we've made, you as board that are referencing this morning over our future, there are really significant challenges for this community – these communities, as much as we are. So I think that's part of the thing. And you continue horizontally on these issues. So thank you for this session, and thank you for everything that you have been doing to try to reach at the constituency level and the SG level.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-16</td>
<td>Mark Cola</td>
<td>As I finish my question, I want to express the reason. Thank you and that's why I'm talking about it. So I was thinking about ICANN's view on planning (now 5.1) and underlying outcomes have been removed. There was a kind of causal reference if you need more revenue, you may have to change your model. There are many people in the business community who feel that ICANN get very close to monetizing money when it had a very open round of new gTLDs without thoroughly analyzing the consequences and the stability factors of whether half of them might fail and overall poor business plan, at cost. So I'm only speaking for myself on this, but I do know many in the global business community who are very concerned that ICANN business model not become about delivering new products other than what are really needed to meet our core mission. So if you don't have dedicated financial and accounting teams, the way you deal with the comments that you get from the community and incorporate them into the plans, and as a final result, the quality of the plans. That was my point.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>This was a clarifying question to a comment made by a panel during the public session, not referring to a section of the strategic plan itself. No changes necessary.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-19</td>
<td>Luis Schuman</td>
<td>I'm wondering – some of the logic might be double clicker, but I think it also might reflect priorities. I would actually put strengthening cost management and financial accountability as # 1. I would put the financial planning as # 2, and I don't know how I'm clear about what enhance ICANN's understanding of the domain marketplace actually means unless I want to # 1 Mylin's comment about making sure that we're not monetizing for the sake of monetizing, delegating new gTLDs that could potentially fail. So I probably would advise a deeper dive or a rethink about that what means, enhancing understanding of it. You create the market in some aspects. You know, you've got the pool. You delegate or don't delegate under certain circumstances. So I think – it's not even sure that that is part of your long-term financial sustainability. I think there's their needs to be a lot more clarification of that.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>Goals under objective on Financials have been rephrased and edited to clarify the strategic intent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 25 to 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-19</td>
<td>Luis Schuman</td>
<td>The other thing I can't see here, and I don't know if it's appropriate at this high-level hearing, in terms of financial stability is also about investment and making sure that there are funds and invested funds. This goes to the reserve as well as to other issues that have come to the fore in the last year or two: in terms of ICANN's financial position. So I think, if it's appropriate, maybe add something in about financial planning/strategic planning – not enhancing the model but recognizing that there's an investment as well as sort of the understanding of the marketplace. The need to – I guess what I'm trying to say is ICANN's standing on its own as an institution as opposed to creating a market through delegations of names.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>The goal on planning (now # 1), and underlying objectives have been removed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 25 &amp; 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-36</td>
<td>John Garner</td>
<td>I would like to take the chance to thank this group and highlight the importance of its work. One particular aspect of the importance of its work has to do with the unique nature of ICANN's mission includes a statement that ICANN shall not act outside its mission. It's actually an interesting statement, not common in organizations. Given that some aspects of ICANN's mission are very tightly constrained within the mission statement for certain Internet Identifier spaces, I'm going to be the group of this make sure that you end up with a strategic plan that have goals that are actually consistent with that mission.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>