1 1 #1 1 ICANN Identifier (1) In the age of global unique identifiers, there are two areas where a stationary email address would go a long way toward the security and governance of unique identifier systems. 

* Improvements to usability of IANA registries, e.g., through use of open source infrastructure, IANA registries, especially around the web-relevant registries, currently have poor participation, and I believe much of the non-use is because the processes for updating, saving, commenting, reviewing those registries are cumbersome compared to the alternatives (e.g., WHOIS, Open Source Registries, etc.). I’d suggest as a strategic management of IANA should include the effort to survey the uses, ask additional technology, analyze the transparency and effectiveness of the registration methods. I would include MM types and URI structures, but also look at requirements of communities that currently maintain internetwork-registries outside of IANA.

-support, with edits

2 4 & 11 ICANN Identifier (4) As far as use of OCP, the current focus on TLD relocation in ICANN policies for new development should be expanded to include a focus on other bases to actual Use of OCPs embedded in other globally unique identifiers, including email addresses and URLs. In particular, moving from having different types of identifiers needs some way of easily assessing the usability of the entire identifier for the full range uses of that identifier, including comparisons, recognition, and translation. There is a gap between the development of TLD rules and the actual end-users that should be addressed in the framework of this strategic plan.

-support, with edits

3 3 James Gannon (3) What exactly will I comment overall that the strategic plan is lacking some of the core aspects of strategic plans such as basic analysis, PESTER/SWOT, and that there is a strong lack of strategic narrative across the document (I suggest that this document was created by asking the department heads to generate their own risk and objectives and not created in a cross-functional manner). This has resulted in a strong tactical focus within what should be a strategic document, and given some of the evolving fundamental assumptions that are present (ICANN vs PTI) I suggest a rework and should be rethought for public comment is likely warranted.

-others suggestion

4 4 James Gannon (4) Re the comment on substance however I would suggest reviewing the outcomes and risks to have planer language, in vague phrases such as thought leadership and cyber warfare should be avoided in long term strategic planning as these phrases can pass over time.

-support, with edits

5 3 James Gannon (3) The association of ICANN and deployment and alternative risks is not grounded in any strong factual basis that I am aware of. All risks are certainly an area that needs to be tracked and not something that is one-time.

-support, with edits

6 3 James Gannon (3) Re: more strategic focus on the ROM and RMM processes is a appropriate. Great integration of this area with the RIM is extremely important. I suggest that a separate paper on this topic be written to define the tools and strategy for the same time period due to the lengthy arrangement (ICANN vs PTI).

-support, with edits

7 3 James Gannon (3) Given the timescale currently being explored within IPv6 deployment, ICANN should be seen to have a more strategic role in targeted outreach and promoting adoption via 3rd parties

-concern

8 3 James Gannon (3) Strategic Technology themes definition, ICANN has a limited ability to envision coexistence of the DNS and internet identifiers. Where emerging technologies intersect with that must be defined at the strategic level or we risk the damage becoming a technical detail.

-support, with edits

9 3 James Gannon (3) ICANN does not deliver the IANA functions, this section should be moved to a PTI document.

-concern

10 3 James Gannon (3) The outcomes for the section are statements of fact or history, with no ICANN aspect, this section needs to be rewritten to be actual objectives in order to be operationalised.

-concern

11 3 James Gannon (3) The outcome for this section should be mentioned as the 3rd party, with no ICANN aspect, this section needs to be rewritten to be actual objectives in order to be operationalised.

-concern

12 3 James Gannon (3) The outcome states in full is with, with no ICANN aspect, this section needs to be rewritten to be actual objectives in order to be operationalised.

-concern

13 3 James Gannon (3) The objective states in full is with, with no ICANN aspect, this section needs to be rewritten to be actual objectives in order to be operationalised.

-concern

14 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) The most crucial item is the identification of key and elementary community needs based on bottom up Model which will help to reach consensus on new processes in acceptable duration.

-support, with edits

15 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Key benefit of policy development consecutively working groups should also care about technical and financial aspects.

-support, with edits

16 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Ensure that SO and ACs members are effectively representative of their respective communities.

-other suggestion

17 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Review the model to reduce decision making cycle duration by engaging end and more specific community representative stakeholder to avoid fictive stakeholder. (in all cases ICANN should have the ability to alternate between governance Models because in some cases technical issue in or some regions when government is the main actor) the application of the Model will be in a set of time.

-others suggestion

18 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Activate the Review of Geographic Regions process to give the opportunity for emerging regions to have their own AC or SO structures Review membership process of some technical AC such SSAC and RSSAC in order to governance balance of regional representation in addition of technical skills.

-others suggestion

19 4 CHINTU BEN ROMONDA (4) Focus of Academic in less technology developed country in order to spread basic knowledge and give the opportunity to community to join Universal Acceptance efforts. Encourage collaboration between countries of the same region by sharing mutual success experience.

-others suggestion

20 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion

21 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion

22 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion

23 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion

24 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion

25 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion

26 4 Chintu Ben Romondha (4) Leave experience if ICANN acquire the ability to adapt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.

-others suggestion
45.6 ICANN should be transparent and accountable in its processes and decisions, and should ensure that its activities are consistent with the public interest.

Response: Yes. The proposed edits reflect the need for transparency and accountability in ICANN's activities.
With regard to the introduction of new gTLDs: whether that is necessary is another debate, indeed necessary to reach a more diverse Internet end user base. Promoting and improving Universal Acceptance and the implementation of Internationalized domains, including delivering the IANA functions, to address the needs of all these (new) Internet end user groups at any one time must be reasonable. We believe the multistakeholder process should always be built upon cooperation between the various stakeholders involved in this process. Not doing this simply endangers the entire multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique names systems. As such this multistakeholder process is unique and essential to find ways of dealing with the task without restricting the broad based bottom-up consensus input that legitimizes our process. The simple fact that until numbers of volunteers with no financial stake whatsoever in the process are willing to spend enormous numbers of stakeholders in a bottom-up process to arrive at agreed upon positions. It is essential to ICANN as an organization, and it is essential that it works effectively.

The strategy plan focuses on describing a desired state (“the what”) and mission, etc.). We believe that Targeted Outcomes should be aligned with the goal – i.e. (knowledge about ICANN and its mission; ICANN as engaged; education about ICANN’s role and mission, etc.). We believe that Targeted Outcomes should be aligned with the goal – i.e. 1.1 to 1.4 as listed in the draft strategic plan.

We support the four strategic goals 1.1 to 1.4 as listed in the draft strategic plan.

The language for goal 4.2 on page 24 was corrected to reflect the language found on page 22. Other suggestion: the language for goal 4.2 on page 24 was corrected to reflect the language found on page 22.

The strategy plan focuses on describing a desired state ("the what") and mission, etc.). We believe that Targeted Outcomes should be aligned with the goal – i.e. (knowledge about ICANN and its mission; ICANN as engaged; education about ICANN’s role and mission, etc.). We believe that Targeted Outcomes should be aligned with the goal – i.e. 1.1 to 1.4 as listed in the draft strategic plan.

We believe the multistakeholder process is unique and essential to find ways of dealing with the task without restricting the broad based bottom-up consensus input that legitimizes our process. The simple fact that until numbers of volunteers with no financial stake whatsoever in the process are willing to spend enormous numbers of stakeholders in a bottom-up process to arrive at agreed upon positions. It is essential to ICANN as an organization, and it is essential that it works effectively.
60 7 ALAC

Comment

The ALAC agrees that ICANN must replenish its Reserve Fund and that ICANN must continue to fund ongoing initiatives to address essential technical and security requirements. Also, anything ICANN can practically do to strengthen its cost management and financial accountability mechanisms should be addressed with the help of community input. As proposed, data about the directions and trends of the market should be better utilized to effectively guide the organization. But if the ALAC would like to see more analysis on this topic, more specifics on what ICANN is planning to do in this area. As mentioned on page 28 of the draft Strategic Plan, the risk that ICANN’s ability to fulfill its mission due to its inability to adjust to changes in the domain name marketplace that impact funding is a serious concern to ALAC. Entry into the marketplace is not always profitable. Recent research shows that many new entrants are dormant or failing. We note that we have still not seen any research from ICANN that shows where a TLD becomes a cost factor rather than a revenue factor for the organization. This would, we believe, help the organization and the community to make better decisions regarding the evolution of the marketplace.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your comment.

Response

No

61 7 ALAC

Comment

The ALAC agrees that ICANN must replenish its Reserve Fund and that ICANN must continue to fund ongoing initiatives to address essential technical and security requirements. Also, anything ICANN can practically do to strengthen its cost management and financial accountability mechanisms should be addressed with the help of community input. As proposed, data about the directions and trends of the market should be better utilized to effectively guide the organization. But if the ALAC would like to see more analysis on this topic, more specifics on what ICANN is planning to do in this area. As mentioned on page 28 of the draft Strategic Plan, the risk that ICANN’s ability to fulfill its mission due to its inability to adjust to changes in the domain name marketplace that impact funding is a serious concern to ALAC. Entry into the marketplace is not always profitable. Recent research shows that many new entrants are dormant or failing. We note that we have still not seen any research from ICANN that shows where a TLD becomes a cost factor rather than a revenue factor for the organization. This would, we believe, help the organization and the community to make better decisions regarding the evolution of the marketplace.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your comment.

Response

No

62 7 ALAC

Comment

The ALAC agreed with the recent Board decision (with due to substantial ambiguities about the process) to put a portion of the auction proceeds towards replenishing the Reserve Fund. However, this action should be an exception of 'one-off' occurrence, and ICANN OrG must continue to make other positive efforts to address maintaining an agreed level of Reserve Funds. Such adjustments where essential to expenditure and in budgeting and of course continue to make regular contributions.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your comment.

Response

No

63 7 ALAC

Comment

With respect to the issue of lack of alignment or consensus on priorities and goals among ICANN stakeholders that result in conflicts about resource allocation, we suggest that, where such lack of alignment exists, it should be addressed and addressed in a process that engages the wider ICANN community.

Finally, the ALAC/ALI strongly believes that ICANN’s strategic priorities and goals must be resource allocation, not the other way around, and that the maintenance and development of ICANN’s unique multistakeholder system must be primary among those priorities and goals.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your comment.

Response

No

64 8 RSG

Comment

The RySG appreciates the work that has gone into the development of the draft Strategic Plan, and at a high level supports both the proposed Vision for ICANN and the five overarching Strategic Objectives. However, we believe that the plan requires more detail about how the overall objectives will be achieved, as well as how the plan will be costed and ultimately integrated with the financial planning cycle, before we can fully support the release of the Strategic Plan.

Other suggestion

The strategic plan focuses on the description of the vision, objectives, and goals. The description of activities that are performed to achieve these strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the 5-year and annual operating and financial plans.

Response

No

65 8 RSG

Comment

Lack of detail in regard to the relationship between the strategic goals, targeted outcomes, and strategic data is currently unclear. While some of these relationships may have been identified through the trends identification process, they’re not documented in the draft Strategic Plan. Furthermore, the draft Strategic Plan is missing the ‘how’ – specific information about how the targeted outcomes will be achieved and the risks mitigated. More detail in this regard is necessary to better understand both the rationale for the objectives and the process by which ICANN intends to deliver on the plan’s objectives.

We therefore request that ICANN supplement the draft Strategic Plan with specific deliverables for each of the goals and concrete metrics by which success will be determined, along with associated responsibilities, to allow for ICANN and the community to monitor progress and measure success throughout the five-year cycle.

Other suggestion

The process of implementing an operational and financial plan may lead to modification of the strategic plan, in some of its flexibility. The Board is free thus considering a conditional adoption of the strategic plan, subject to adjustments as necessary.

Response

Yes / 3

66 8 RSG

Comment

We welcome the announced new approach to complement the Strategic Plan with a five-year operating plan with details of activities, dependencies, and phasing. However, it would be required about how ICANN’s plans to work and integrate the strategic planning cycle and the organization’s financial planning process to make sure that it doesn’t end up with an approved Strategic Plan that is not properly costed. Related, and referring to ICANN’s desire to move to a two-year budget, we wonder how this change, if and when implemented, may influence the planned integration of operating plan and budget cycles.

Due to the broad and sweeping nature of some of the strategic goals and objectives, the RySG is concerned that the cost of implementing the draft Strategic Plan could well exceed current budget allocations or at least place considerable pressure on ICANN’s resources. The RySG believes that ICANN needs to balance the need to control costs – which the RySG believes should be an organisational priority – with the will to implement a Strategic Plan that could drive ICANN to operating beyond its means. With this in mind, it seems sensible to undertake a high-level exercise prior to Board approval of the Strategic Plan, to ensure that the plan can be fully funded and provide some level of comfort to the community.

Other suggestion

The RySG welcomes the announced new approach to complement the Strategic Plan with a fully-costed five-year operating plan with details of activities, dependencies, and phasing. In addition, it would be required about how ICANN’s plans to work and integrate the strategic planning cycle and the organization’s financial planning process to make sure that it doesn’t end up with an approved Strategic Plan that is not properly costed. Related, and referring to ICANN’s desire to move to a two-year budget, we wonder how this change, if and when implemented, may influence the planned integration of operating plan and budget cycles.

Due to the broad and sweeping nature of some of the strategic goals and objectives, the RySG is concerned that the cost of implementing the draft Strategic Plan could well exceed current budget allocations or at least place considerable pressure on ICANN’s resources. The RySG believes that ICANN needs to balance the need to control costs – which the RySG believes should be an organisational priority – with the will to implement a Strategic Plan that could drive ICANN to operating beyond its means. With this in mind, it seems sensible to undertake a high-level exercise prior to Board approval of the Strategic Plan, to ensure that the plan can be fully funded and provide some level of comfort to the community.

Other suggestion

The process of implementing an operational and financial plan may lead to modifications of the strategic plan, in some of its flexibility. The Board is free thus considering a conditional adoption of the strategic plan, subject to adjustments as necessary.

Response

Yes / 3

67 8 RSG

Comment

We appreciate ICANN’s effort to work with the community to identify the five primary trends expected to impact ICANN’s future, mission and operations, and use these as framework for the development of the draft Strategic Plan, and at a high level supports both the proposed Vision for ICANN and the five overarching Strategic Objectives. The RySG appreciates the effort that has gone into the development of the draft Strategic Plan, and at a high level supports both the proposed Vision for ICANN and the five overarching Strategic Objectives. Furthermore, the draft Strategic Plan is missing the ‘how’ – specific information about how the targeted outcomes will be achieved and the risks mitigated. More detail in this regard is necessary to better understand both the rationale for the objectives and the process by which ICANN intends to deliver on the plan’s objectives. We therefore request that ICANN supplement the draft Strategic Plan with specific deliverables for each of the goals and concrete metrics by which success will be determined, along with associated responsibilities, to allow for ICANN and the community to monitor progress and measure success throughout the five-year cycle.

Other suggestion

The RySG welcomes the announced new approach to complement the Strategic Plan with a fully-costed five-year operating plan with details of activities, dependencies, and phasing. However, it would be required about how ICANN’s plans to work and integrate the strategic planning cycle and the organization’s financial planning process to make sure that it doesn’t end up with an approved Strategic Plan that is not properly costed. Related, and referring to ICANN’s desire to move to a two-year budget, we wonder how this change, if and when implemented, may influence the planned integration of operating plan and budget cycles.

Due to the broad and sweeping nature of some of the strategic goals and objectives, the RySG is concerned that the cost of implementing the draft Strategic Plan could well exceed current budget allocations or at least place considerable pressure on ICANN’s resources. The RySG believes that ICANN needs to balance the need to control costs – which the RySG believes should be an organisational priority – with the will to implement a Strategic Plan that could drive ICANN to operating beyond its means. With this in mind, it seems sensible to undertake a high-level exercise prior to Board approval of the Strategic Plan, to ensure that the plan can be fully funded and provide some level of comfort to the community.

Other suggestion

The RySG welcomes the announced new approach to complement the Strategic Plan with a fully-costed five-year operating plan with details of activities, dependencies, and phasing. However, it would be required about how ICANN’s plans to work and integrate the strategic planning cycle and the organization’s financial planning process to make sure that it doesn’t end up with an approved Strategic Plan that is not properly costed. Related, and referring to ICANN’s desire to move to a two-year budget, we wonder how this change, if and when implemented, may influence the planned integration of operating plan and budget cycles.

Due to the broad and sweeping nature of some of the strategic goals and objectives, the RySG is concerned that the cost of implementing the draft Strategic Plan could well exceed current budget allocations or at least place considerable pressure on ICANN’s resources. The RySG believes that ICANN needs to balance the need to control costs – which the RySG believes should be an organisational priority – with the will to implement a Strategic Plan that could drive ICANN to operating beyond its means. With this in mind, it seems sensible to undertake a high-level exercise prior to Board approval of the Strategic Plan, to ensure that the plan can be fully funded and provide some level of comfort to the community.

Other suggestion

The process of implementing an operational and financial plan may lead to modifications of the strategic plan, in some of its flexibility. The Board is free thus considering a conditional adoption of the strategic plan, subject to adjustments as necessary.

Response

Yes / 3

68 8 RSG

Comment

The process of implementing an operational and financial plan may lead to modifications of the strategic plan, in some of its flexibility. The Board is free thus considering a conditional adoption of the strategic plan, subject to adjustments as necessary.

Other suggestion

The strategic plan focuses on the description of the vision, objectives, and goals. The description of activities that are performed to achieve these strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the 5-year and annual operating and financial plans.

Response

No

69 9 RSG

Comment

The RSG welcomes ICANN retaining that it shall not act outside of its mission (b) and shall be held accountable to its mission statement. Additionally, we believe is (g) it’s important to have reinterpreted that ICANN is not a regulator.

Other suggestion

The RSG welcomes ICANN retaining that it shall not act outside of its mission (b) and shall be held accountable to its mission statement. Additionally, we believe is (g) it’s important to have reinterpreted that ICANN is not a regulator.

Response

Thank you for your support.
The GNSO Council recommends adding clarifying language that Supporting Organizations will be strengthened by a small change, "...and active, recognizing, understanding, and balancing its evolving legal obligations in relation to activities that this sentence be revised to read, "Improve the effectiveness of ICANN's...". The GNSO Council supports the continued examination of legislation and regulation to... The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks. The GNSO Council is concerned that there is a danger in privileging 'effectiveness' in the... 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.

The RrSG would like to see ICANN testing outside its traditional areas of operation. Potentially, ICANN could play a useful role in coordinating (for example) unique identifiers to the IoT that would guarantee universal-resolution. Two points on this - ICANNs actually coming quite late to the party. Other organizations have had ambitions to perform such a role for some time, ICANN will need to earn that role, it won't just be gifted it as it was the IANA.

The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. The GNSO Council recognizes the potential impact of greater regulatory activity and other internal and external factors on ICANN's existing gTLD policies, and on ongoing and future GNSO Policy Development Processes and implementation Review Teams. These potential impacts underscore the importance of ICANN's next strategic plan continuing to guide ICANN's work and the ICANN community towards more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the fine terms that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Submission #</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>10 GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council requests information regarding the intended implementation of the outcome. Without further clarification, we suggest that &quot;new technologies&quot; be instead re-worded to: &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 #2.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 17 &amp; p. 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>10 GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council requests the Targeted Outcomes and Roles, but can only accept this outcome subject to the satisfactory completion of relevant policy development work that is yet to be undertaken. Accordingly, we request that this objective be reworded so as not to presuppose any outcome: &quot;Subjected to completion, GNSO Council approval and ICANN Board accord of a Final Report of the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, ICANN shall plan effort to: (i) develop 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>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 17 &amp; 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>10 GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council requests the objective, particularly with respect to geopolitical issues that impact GNSO Policy Development Processes and Implementation Reviews.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>10 GNSO Council</td>
<td>The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Roles, particularly: Rather tech savvy systems can inform the ongoing or future work of GNSO Policy Development and Implementation processes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>10 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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>10 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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>10 GNSO Council</td>
<td>While market trends should be considered in organizational guidance, it should be noted that market trends are only relevant to the extent that they 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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>10 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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Thank you for the comments with the plan.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>The BC notes that ICANN is preparing to amend its Vision statement in this next Strategic Plan, that the Mission Statement be revised to acknowledge the continued growth and development of the GAC.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>The introduction section of the strategic plan already acknowledges &quot;a renewed vision statement.&quot; No change necessary.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>The BC notes that ICANN's mission has not been changed, and supports this decision.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Regarding Strategic Objectives: The BC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are surfaced with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Concerned: What comprises the global public interest? BC notes the phrase needs to be defined before it is used. As noted most recently in our Jun-2013 comment to Accountability and Transparency Review Forum (ATRFT), here are the principles and process the BC suggests to define the global public interest for ICANN purposes. The BC has previously recommended a definition for public interest that is limited to the scope of ICANN's mission, namely, to assure the availability and integrity of resolution and resolution services. But it is not for the BC or the ATRFT to define public interest for ICANN. The definition should be derived through a process that is open to the ICANN community and Internet stakeholders—such as a prominent role for representatives of governments, which often claim to have unique standing to know what is in the public interest of their citizens.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>ICANN's role is to serve the global public interest at a key aspect of all work done and decisions made. The definition of what is in the public interest is situation-specific. For the purposes of the strategic plan, ICANN has provided more specific language where appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 &amp; 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Regarding Strategic Objectives: The BC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are surfaced with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>In terms of their priority in how ICANN treats these Strategic Objectives, it stands to reason that #5 should be first because that is in itself ICANN's main remit.</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 referencing only.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 17 &amp; 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Regarding Strategic Objectives: The BC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are surfaced with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>The BC agrees Security is next 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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Supporting: The effectiveness of the multistakeholder model is clearly a priority. ICANN is diligently developing a reputation for being slow, combative, and less transparent. Decisions and processes in the EPDG are just the latest examples in this regard.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Regarding Strategic Objectives: The BC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are surfaced with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>11 Business Constituency</td>
<td>Regarding Strategic Objectives: The BC notes that Strategic Objectives result from a diligent outreach and information gathering process, and generally supports objectives that are surfaced with this level of rigor and diverse input.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>12 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/seascion/cmnid61%D9%82%D8%B6%D8%A7%D9%8A%D9%85%D9%90%D9%8A%D9%82%D9%90%D9%85%D9%84%D9%92-30-strategic-publicic-community-session-and">https://gac.icann.org/seascion/cmnid61قضايمِيقِملْ-30-strategic-publicic-community-session-and</a>: <a href="https://www.icann.org/meetings/note/edac_attachments/20160411/onb/zob/UdO5GACtendsSessi">https://www.icann.org/meetings/note/edac_attachments/20160411/onb/zob/UdO5GACtendsSessi</a> on-1513d943b-icann61-openplenary-0001-0001.pdf).</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>12 GAC</td>
<td>The fact the specific opportunity afforded to GAC members and observers to contribute to the development phase of the initial draft strategic plan is important because active government participation in ICANN activities is a principle firmly rooted in the ICANN Bylaws. That said, the BC supports the new Strategic Plan for 2021-2025. “footnote: The Bylaws clearly state that ICANN itself ‘does not hold any governmental authority regulatory agency’ (see, ICANN Bylaws Section 1.1(a)). The ICANN Bylaws commit the organization to &quot;transparent, transparent, and transparent multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector,&quot; while also noting in the public policy advice of governments and public authorities’ (see ICANN Bylaws section 1.2(a)). Moreover, ICANN’s core values obliged the organization to recognize that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and only help into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities’ (see ICANN Bylaws section 1.2(b)).</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>12 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 multistakeholder 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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>12 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 multistakeholder decision-making process; and 3. Strengthen the inclusivity and openness of ICANN’s multistakeholder model by improving and sustaining diverse representation and active, effective participation.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 14 5.5</td>
<td>The GAC believes that the second strategic goal would be diluted by specifically mentioning the contribution of policy advice in the multistakeholder decision making process. Thus, in the list of targeted outcomes for strategic goal 2, the term “policy advice” should be added. Thus, the following targeted outcome should be amended to include a reference to policy advice. Thus: Multistakeholder model processes — such as policy development and reviews, among others — continue to evolve in an efficient and accountable manner.” should be amended to read: Multistakeholder model processes — such as policy development, policy advice and reviews, among others — continue to evolve in an efficient and accountable manner.” (recommended sawedled in bold red font)</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>In reference to policy advice was added to the outcomes under goal 2.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 12 5.5</td>
<td>The GAC welcomes the draft plan’s emphasis in strategic goal 2.2 to improve and sustain the efficiency of rule making, active, effective participation”. 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 ICANN69 in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017, the two advisories encouraged the Board to incorporate new document management and briefing capabilities to enable non-expert stakeholders to meaningfully participate in ICANN’s processes and make their voices, their needs and interests heard (see, e.g., <a href="https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann60-abu-dhabi-communique">https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann60-abu-dhabi-communique</a>). In its reply, the Board referred to the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI), launched in January 2019, which will, hopefully, lead to the creation of a document management system that as required by the ALAC and the GAC — all-stakeholder, 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 2.2 or elsewhere in the strategic plan.</td>
<td>Other suggestion</td>
<td>The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired end state (&quot;the what&quot;) of accomplishing tactical objectives to accomplish the (&quot;how&quot;) to hit the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the opening plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 13 3.3</td>
<td>Should be removed as its appropriate location is within PTI’s documentation set and remit.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Removed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 13 3.3</td>
<td>Update to read “new technologies which directly impact the reliability, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure”.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 13 3.3</td>
<td>This introductory statement is acceptable.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 13 3.3</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>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 13 3.3</td>
<td>Evolve ICANN's governance model to remain relevant, transparent and accountable.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 13 3.3</td>
<td>Ensure the effectiveness of ICANN’s policy development processes; There is a danger in predisposing; the Policy Development Process without sufficiently considering inclusivity. We would therefore prefer “improve the effectiveness and inclusiveness of ICANN’s multistakeholder policy development processes”.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 13 3.3</td>
<td>Address and manage the impact of regulation and regulation; and The Board refines the call for action to remain the same. It implies that ICANN’s effective, transparent and accountable. We feel that the wording should acknowledge that ICANN is far from perfect in these areas. A better wording would be “Evolve ICANN’s governance model to be increasingly effective, transparent, and accountable.”</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 13 3.3</td>
<td>Secure IANA’s technical, cultural and financially sustainable</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 13 3.3</td>
<td>The statement is acceptable.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 13 3.3</td>
<td>We question the value of only mentioning the security/issue (DDoS attacks linked to IoT devices on pg. 8) 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 device on page 7.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 13 3.3</td>
<td>Agree with targeted outcomes and risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 13 3.3</td>
<td>Agree with outcomes and risks. Specifically we concur the goal of developing a coordinated emergency plan.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 13 3.3</td>
<td>We think the first sentence should be updated as follows: remove the word “stakeholder” with DNS and unique identifiers system. The inherent security of the DNS and unique identifiers system; measurement increases, due to higher adoption of global open Internet standards and greater awareness of security threats among stakeholders.”</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>Accepted the suggested edit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 13 3.3</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 13 3.3</td>
<td>Acceptable summary.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 13 3.3</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 13 3.3</td>
<td>Remove “global public interest” and replace with “stakeholder, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure”.</td>
<td>Support, with edits</td>
<td>CAMA's role to serve the global public interest is a key aspect of all actions and decisions made. For this section of the Strategic Plan, we concur that reference to the more specific aspect of ICANN's mission is appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 13 3.3</td>
<td>While we agree with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks, the NCSG believes participation should also be informed by evidence and knowledge. We therefore suggest revising this sentence to read, “... , share, informed, effective participation.”</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Accepted suggested edit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>p. 13 &amp; 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 13 3.3</td>
<td>Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 13 3.3</td>
<td>Invite to read “new technologies which directly impact the reliability, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure” to ensure ICANN stays on trend.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Thank you for your support.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 133 13 3.3  | ICANN views the IANA functions once the implementation of PTI in Section 2.3 should be removed as its appropriate location is within PTI’s documentation set and remit. | Support | ICANN’s Bylaw oblige it to establish an entity for the performance of the IANA functions, and for IANA to serve as the sole member of that entity. In addition, ICANN also obligates it to consult with that affiliate, and for ICANN to monitor that affiliate’s performance of the IANA Functions under ICANN’s contract. ICANN has deep, fundamental responsibility for the delivery of the IANA Functions, and it is appropriate to reflect this responsibility by both in ICANN’s Strategic Plan as well as providing operational details on that work in the affiliate’s documentation. | p. 17 & p. 18
The goal would not meet the opportunity to evaluate a new round of gTLDs. We ask that
the sentence be revised as to read: "Evaluate a properly funded, managed, and risk-
evaluated expansion of gTLDs as.

Support, with edits

We agree that efforts to increase organizational and stakeholder
involvement will contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in
the outcomes under goal 2.1.

Support, with edits

The goals under section #2 on ICANN's governance, and the
associated targeted outcomes and risks have been added to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.

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.

Support

The goals under section #4 on ICANN's governance, and the
associated targeted outcomes and risks have been added to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.

Support

We acknowledge that the Board has been working on this effort and I am thankful for it. I would like to know from the Board whether you take into consideration these goals and time span when you are going to rephase these goals.

Support

The ALAC Members who participated in the poll are (alphabetical order by first
name): Bastian Morgen, Basile-Georges, Hadia Elminiawi, Humberto Carrasco, Holly Raiche, Javier Rua-
Jemaa, John Laprise, Kaili Kan, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Homqvist, Sebastian Bachhler, Seun Ojedeji and
Tijani Ben Jemaa. One ALAC Member, Joanna Kulesza, did not participate. You may view the
result independently under: https://00000.aliscultus.com/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb

Support

With respect to previous edits that have been added to the text, some issues
are still not being addressed.

Support

The ALAC Members who participated in the poll are (alphabetical order by first
name): Bastian Morgen, Basile-Georges, Hadia Elminiawi, Humberto Carrasco, Holly Raiche, Javier Rua-
Jemaa, John Laprise, Kaili Kan, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Homqvist, Sebastian Bachhler, Seun Ojedeji and
Tijani Ben Jemaa. One ALAC Member, Joanna Kulesza, did not participate. You may view the
result independently under: https://00000.aliscultus.com/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb
datas/pollS/00000/aliscultusweb

Support

The goals under section #4 on ICANN's governance, and the
associated targeted outcomes and risks have been added to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.

Support

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.

Other suggestion

Thank you for your support.
The comment by Barrack Otieno: That is number one. this strategic planning exercise that we are setting in place. The second thing is, with regard to collaboration with country code top-level domain registries, again, we need to continue strengthening that. I see that happening in other regions, years. And we have seen some considerable growth on the ground as a result of that. But, regional organizations. I'm saying that having worked with the team from Africa for the last five years, that's something from a registry -- certainly the registry stakeholder perspective that's been very, very important. So I see 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 awareness campaign about one of the biggest expansions of the Internet that we've seen in many years. So -- and see that that is directly related to the support and adoption of IDNs. Thanks.

The comment by John Curran: We are seeing an increasing interest from regulators in country code top-level domain registries. And it's bringing more and more attention to the IDNs, the -- the IDNs and the IDNCs. And I would also add, that you know, ICANN is one side, one of the challenges of many of the new registry operators -- and this is something we're trying to engage GDc and the board on a number of occasions -- is the lack of global awareness of what was a significant expansion of TLDs across the Internet, and it's global. So I think that's really important. And I think that's something from a registry -- certainly the registry stakeholder perspective that's been very, very important.

The comment by Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I wish to comment on the bullet 3 worldwide deployment IPv6. This issue is on the table since many, many years in ICANN and also in its predecessor. There was a term "transition". But finally in plenipotentiary 2018 in Dubai the word "deployment" was used. However, you need a close collaboration with other organization involved in order to have the countries they wish and they're eager to have IPv6 but this obstacle does not allow them to do that. This is an important issue. And I think this is one of the very, very important elements that ICANN needs to embark on. Thank you.

The comment by PS-9: Another suggestion. ICANN is already doing awareness raising with the UASG (Universal Acceptance Steering Group), including IDNs. Reaching this strategic goal will require significant collaboration. The outcome under goal 3.1 has been added to acknowledge the collective efforts needed to support this goal.

The comment by Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ICANN is already doing awareness raising with the UASG (Universal Acceptance Steering Group), including IDNs. Reaching this strategic goal will require significant collaboration. The outcome under goal 3.1 has been added to acknowledge the collective efforts needed to support this goal.

The comment by Barrack Otieno: ICANN is planning a global document, not just the regional strategic plan. No changes made here. At a regional level, calls could work with RFIs and regional TLD organizations with capacity development on DNS technical issues. IPv6 is one of the areas of collaboration at a regional level.

The comment by John Curran: Comments on the content on the bullet worldwide deployment IPv6. We are seeing an increasing interest from regulators in country code top-level domain registries. And it's bringing more and more attention to the IDNs, the -- the IDNs and the IDNCs. And it's global. So I think that's really important. And I think that's something from a registry -- certainly the registry stakeholder perspective that's been very, very important.

The comment by PS-9: This comment is focused on the bullet worldwide deployment IPv6. We are seeing an increasing interest from regulators in country code top-level domain registries. And it's bringing more and more attention to the IDNs, the -- the IDNs and the IDNCs. And it's global. So I think that's really important. And I think that's something from a registry -- certainly the registry stakeholder perspective that's been very, very important.

The comment by John Curran: Comments on the content on the bullet worldwide deployment IPv6. We are seeing an increasing interest from regulators in country code top-level domain registries. And it's bringing more and more attention to the IDNs, the -- the IDNs and the IDNCs. And it's global. So I think that's really important. And I think that's something from a registry -- certainly the registry stakeholder perspective that's been very, very important.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Submission #</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Issue Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 161 | PS-14 | Anonymous | [The point here is that the actual collaboration with country code registries is fewer and more focused. 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.]
| | | | | Support, with edits | Yes | p. 24 | 10 / 10 |
| 162 | PS-15 | Aniruddha Goyal | [We are 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?]
| | | | | Other suggestion | Progress is tracked through accountability indicators (https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators). The plan's introduction has been made to that apparent. | Yes | p. 3 |
| 163 | PS-16 | Rob den Hoed | [I’d like to make two comments. The first one is, we’ve come really a long way over the last few years, let’s say the last five years. I’m in this community 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.]
| | | | | Support | Thank you for your comments. | No | 10 / 10 |
| 164 | PS-16 | Rob den Hoed | [As an observer – if you look at your strategic objectives and your strategic goals, most of them are specified by a yes, which is to indicate that you state an action in most cases and not a target, 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?] | | Other suggestion | Several of the goals were repackaged to better reflect a desired end state rather than an activity to perform. | Yes | p. 8 & 9 p. 17, 18, 21 p. 22 & 23 p. 25 to 29 |
| 165 | PS-17 | Stephanie Perri | [I would like to echo the previous speakers’ comments. Thank you for your support.]
| | | | | Support | Thank you for your support. | No | 10 / 10 |
| 166 | PS-16 | Milan Cole | [I'm going to copy my comments by testing an experience that perhaps尼斯 will stick with me for a long time. 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 GNO – Bruce Tonkin was the chair of the GNO at the time, and we collected $5,000 and funded a stakeholders 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 taking it. But I think we have to be very clear that with the kinds of changes that, Chevron, you as board that were referencing the meeting earlier for our future, there are really significant challenges for this community – these communities, as you know, to be able to properly digested and be able to provide informed information beyond those of us who work constantly horizontally on these issues.]
| | | | | Support | Thank you for everything that you have been doing to try to reach at the constituency level and the GG level. | No | 10 / 10 |
| 167 | PS-16 | Milan Cole | [At this point my question is, ‘what actually did audience, exist and think – and that’s why I’m asking – was actually happening when I was on the call? And what I’m trying to look at is to see if we have handled the comments, if we have not handled the comments, what was going on? There was a kind of oral reference to if you need more revenue, you may have to change your business model. There are many people in the business community who feel that ICANN got very close to phasing 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 due to poor business plans, at a lower.] | | Other suggestion | There was a clarifying question to a comment made by a panelist during the public session, not referring to a section of the strategic plan itself. No changes necessary. | No | 10 / 10 |
| 168 | PS-19 | Luc Schulan | [I wonder – at the moment this might be dodging critical, but I think it also might reflect priorities. I would actually put strengthening cost management and financial accountability at 5.1. I would put the financial planning at 5.2, and I don’t know if I’m clear about what an enhancement to ICANN understanding of the domain marketplace actually means unless I want to add 5.1 Morey’s comment about making sure that we’re not monetising for the sake of monetising, delegating new gTLDs that could potentially fail.]
| | | | | Other suggestion | Goals under objective on Financials have been re-stated andedited to clarify the strategic intent. | Yes | p. 25 to 29 |
| 169 | PS-19 | Luc Schulan | [On the other thing I don’t see you here, and I don’t know if it’s appropriate at this higher 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 these financial planning, as planning – not enhancing the model but recognising that there’s investment as well as kind of this understanding of the marketplace. We need to – I guess what I’m trying to say is that ICANN’s standing on its own as an institution as opposed to creating a market through delegation of names.]
| | | | | Other suggestion | The goal on planning (now 5.1) and underlying objectives have been removed. | Yes | p. 25 & 26 |
| 170 | PS-20 | John Curran | [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 organisations. 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 work of this group to make sure that you end up with a strategic plan that has goals that are actually consistent with that mission.]
| | | | | Support | Thank you for your support. | No | 10 / 10 |