ICANN's Draft Vision, Mission & Focus Areas for a Five-Year Strategic Plan
29 October 2013 – 31 January 2014 Public Comment Summary and Responses

This document contains a summary of the public comments received in response to a working draft - ICANN's Draft Vision, Mission & Focus Areas for a Five-Year Strategic Plan, 29 October 2013 – 31 January 2014, and Staff's proposed responses (included below in **green text**). The comments are summarized in order of submission for Vision, Mission and each of the Five Focus Areas, as applicable. General comments are summarized in "general comments." Even though this summary was drawn up to reflect as accurately and objectively as possible the views expressed by participants, it does not substitute in any way the original contributions which are publicly available for full reference at: http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-strategic-29oct13/.

In addition to comments submitted through the online public comment process, the summary includes comments from the public session held in Buenos Aires on 18 November 2013. See full transcript of the public session.

Contributions provided by:

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ICANN At-Large Staff
Business Constituency (BC)	Chris Chaplow
GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)	Keith Drazek
	Kavouss Arasteh
	Marilyn Cade
	Mark Carvell
	Bertrand De La Chapelle
	Chris Chaplow
	Chuck Gomes
	Olga Madruga-Forti
	Roelof Meijer
	Ray Plzak
	Rinalia Abdul Rahim
	Kristina Rosette
	Marcelo Saldanha
	Rohit Thomas
	Paul Twomey
	Mathieu Weill

DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN VISION, MISSION AND FOCUS AREAS	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
VISION	The ALAC supports the ICANN vision as stipulated, but would prefer to include aspects of security of Internet and the trust in the Internet: "...to support a single, open, and globally interoperable Internet with a secure and trusted DNS". **Response: Vision has been reworded to address various suggestions**. The BC believes that ICANN's vision should focus on its core role in establishing a system of unique identifiers to support a single, open, globally interoperable Internet. ~~ICANN's vision is that of~~ **ICANN is an independent, globally recognized organization trusted world-wide to coordinate the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers to support a single, open globally interoperable Internet.** ~~ICANN builds trust through serving the public interest, and incorporating the transparent and effective cooperation among stakeholders worldwide to facilitate its coordination role.~~ The BC suggests that ICANN's previous vision --'One World – One Internet' -- had the benefits of simplicity, and that ICANN consider retaining this language, either as a stand-alone phrase or in addition to the new language. **Response: Feedback incorporated-see revisions to Vision.** The RySG: Key element missing - using bottom-up multi-stakeholder processes. **Response: Feedback incorporated-see revisions to Vision.** **Community input during 18 November 2013 public session in Buenos Aires:** Mathieu Weill, CEO of AFNIC: add the word "accountable": "ICANN's vision is that of an independent, accountable, global organization…" **Response: Accountability is how ICANN serves the public interest and serving the public interest has been incorporated in the Vision. Also, accountability is reflected in Public Responsibility focus area – "Promote ethics, transparency and accountability."**
MISSION	The BC believes that the limited mission currently articulated in the Bylaws is the best defense for ICANN against its detractors. The BC expressed an interest in community views as to whether the mission as written needs further elaboration on how to best implement it. **Response: Mission is a reflection of the mission articulated in the Bylaws.** The RySG: Key element missing - using bottom-up multi-stakeholder processes. **Response: Mission is a reflection of the mission articulated in the Bylaws. The notion of bottom-up multi-stakeholder processes has been incorporated into the revised Vision.**
FOCUS AREA I: Evolving ICANN's implementation of	The ALAC advises adding: "Further strive to prepare a framework for the internationalization of the IANA function." To reach the required trust and to make the internationalization meaningful, the ALAC believes that

	the IANA function should be internationalized as well. **Response: This was considered and determined that internationalization of the IANA function is an outcome - covered by "Globalized ICANN's operational functions."**
the multistakeholder approach for coordination	

The [ALAC](): focus areas paragraph should include "with a secure and trusted DNS" each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. **Response: These concepts are specifically articulated in Vision and Mission.**

The [BC](): While the model of multi-stakeholder engagement within ICANN will (and should) continue to evolve, the fundamental cornerstones of ICANN's structure – with a leading role for the private sector and the ability for all sectors to participate – must be preserved. **Response: Comment has been noted**.

The [BC]() provided the following specific input: **Response: This input was considered in refining focus area goals and developing outcomes and measurements.**

Focus Area Goals *As listed in the Focus Area section of the draft*	Outcomes *What are the specific outcomes or achievements we should target for this effort?*	Measures *What quantitative / qualitative elements should we consider in measuring progress / results?*
<u>Further internationalize</u> ICANN to be more inclusive by becoming more multilingual and providing tools for connection and collaboration worldwide.	• Greater meeting participation from non-OECD participants • Increased availability and use of interpretation at ICANN meetings • More translation for key documents, including working documents	• Use of translation and interpretation services • More key documents available in multiple languages
Bring ICANN to the world through greater <u>regional engagement</u> to reinforce our international role.	• Greater regional awareness of what exactly ICANN is and does • Clearer role for new regional offices and ICANN regional Vice Presidencies • Clearer relationship with and participation in regional and national IGF Initiatives and similar forums • Engagement in regional media relating to ICANN's role and activities • Significantly improved easy to understand materials for 'laypersons'	• Expanded ICANN staff and press visibility in different regions, with a special focus on Africa, Latin America and developing economies
Evolve our <u>Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee structures</u> to meet the changing needs of our diverse, global stakeholders.	• Clarified roles for AC and SOs, especially GAC and ALAC • Consider new ways to represent the interests of the global user community, especially to support engagement and participation by business associations from developing countries to assist user awareness and familiarity with ICANN.	

Evolve ICANN Meetings to better support the global community's changing needs.	• Improve engagement by local/regional actors, especially members of the local private sector and civil society. • Consider establishing pre-ICANN meetings to educate local actors regarding policy development within ICANN. • Increase press outreach around (and pre-) meetings to explain the issues at hand and encourage participation.	• Begin engagement with regional actors well in advance of ICANN meetings, and establish metrics for local engagement (e.g., target a certain number of local Internet businesses to participate in each meeting). •
Evolve policy development and decision-making processes to be more inclusive, efficient and effective.	• Streamlines processes and improve opportunities for participation. • Create "snapshot" documents that show current state of policy debate and historical views, allowing newer actors to come up to speed more quickly.	• Reduce decision making times. • Enable improved remote participation in policy development

The RySG: point out how many ccTLDs there were in 1998, instead of saying that ccNSO was not there.
Response: number of ccTLDs has been added, as suggested.

The RySG suggested the following wording change "Evolve ICANN Meetings to better support the global community's changing needs within its existing charter, including continually improving remote participation capabilities", so that this bullet cannot be interpreted as authorization for staff to expand ICANN's mission.
Response: This item has been removed / reworded.

Community input during 18 November 2013 public session in Buenos Aires:
- Marilyn Cade cautioned about using the word "regional" in "regional strategy" and to focus more on what "regional" implies, since many groupings of countries are not considered a region. The practice is much deeper than "regional." **Response: Comment has been noted. The intention is that "regional strategy" includes engaging locally, identifying issues with local significance/impact, addressing the needs of local community, etc.**
- Marilyn Cade clarified: "We're not just trying to spread the word about ICANN as a multistakeholder environment. We're trying to build the capacity of participants to participate in an informed way so that they are contributing to the stability of the organization and to the evolution of the organization." **Response: This is addressed in Focus Area V. "Develop and implement a global public responsibility framework."**
- Marilyn Cade expressed a concern that "that staff and board may be getting ahead of the community on preconceptions about what the meeting structure ought to look like." **Response: Meeting Strategy Working Group is considering this topic. See Report.**
- Marilyn Cade commented regarding {Considered additions or changes from the community and Strategy Panels, as appropriate}: "It is very important to many of us that it is clearly understand that the strategy panels, which might be able to provide creative thinking but are not tied very closely to the community, that they are only one input and that this process remains the primary input." **Response: The input of Strategy**

	Panels, and public comments on their output, will be considered in the strategy development process. See updated timeline and schedule.
	• Kavouss Arasteh suggested removing the word "coordination" from the Focus Area title: " This 'Evolving ICANN's implementation of the multistakeholder approach' is not only for coordination but many things, so perhaps you don't need to limit it to coordination. Keep it general." **Response: "Coordination" has been deleted.**
	• Kavouss Arasteh questioned the meaning behind "Further internationalize ICANN to be more inclusive by becoming more multilingual…..": " Do you mean that you further internationalize ICANN just for multilingual or you further internationalize ICANN to be accountable to the multistakeholders?" **Response: This point has been addressed and the wording changed "1.1 Further internationalize ICANN to be more relevant inclusive, connected and collaborative worldwide."**
	• Kavouss Arasteh suggested that the word "accountability" be added where appropriate. **Response: Accountability is how ICANN serves the public interest and serving the public interest and has been incorporated in the Vision. Accountability is reflected in Public Responsibility focus area – "Promote ethics, transparency and accountability."**
	• Bertrand De La Chapelle questioned whether "In the policy development and decision-making processes, 'to be more inclusive, efficient and effective' is the 'more' necessary or is it implicitly saying that it is not enough now so to be fully inclusive, efficient and effective might be a more positive message?" **Response: Specifics of "more" is defined through Outcomes (KSF) and Measures (KPI).**
FOCUS AREA II: Developing a world-class public responsibility framework	The ALAC recommends adding: "Engage and develop the End-Users community globally for full involvement in policy development and decision making processes." The ALAC cannot speak about public interest without considering the end-users' interest. **Response: This comment has been noted. End-users are included and referenced in the narrative preceding several focus areas, and are incorporated in the references to the multistakeholder approach and processes.**
	The ALAC: focus areas paragraph should include "with a secure and trusted DNS" each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. **Response: These concepts are specifically articulated in Vision and Mission.**
	The BC: The public responsibility should be clearly defined if used in the strategic plan, particularly because there has been debate in the community regarding the term 'public interest.' To the extent both terms may be useful, the community should understand what each means and how they are different. More discussion is needed within the broad community. The bullet points highlight outreach and engagement, rather than public responsibility. **Response: This focus area has been revised based on feedback and comments received and will continue to be refined through the definition of Outcomes (KSF) and Measures (KPI).**
	Work included within 'competition, consumer trust and consumer choice' in the previous Strategic Plan (2012-2015) should be included in this focus area. **Response: The referenced work includes: • Maintain single authoritative root • Increase TLD options in more languages • Rollout new gTLDs including IDNs • Lower registration abuse • Increase industry competition. This work is covered in a different focus area, primarily in Unique Identifier Ecosystem and Technical and Operational Excellence.**

The BC suggests ICANN change the phrase "world-class," to "high-caliber" or "robust" or "first-rate." **Response: "world-class" has been removed.**

The BC provided the following specific input: **Response: This input was considered in refining focus area goals and developing outcomes and measures**.

Focus Area Goals *As listed in the Focus Area section of the draft*	Outcomes *What are the specific outcomes or achievements we should target for this effort?*	Measures *What quantitative / qualitative elements should we consider in measuring progress / results?*
Support developing communities through programs that will enable them to understand and participate in the ICANN process and the multi-stakeholder model.	Support in general through outreach program, with a focus on engagement with users, not only suppliers of registry and registrar services.	Difficult to quantify, perhaps benchmark business and user survey in different regions from time to time.
Address the challenges faced by developing countries seeking inclusion and development, consistent with ICANN's mission and core values.	Support in general through outreach program. Provide support to participation of business users from developing countries within the existing fellowship program, or develop specialized support to the user constituencies with specific targets to build sustainable participation from developing countries.	Measure participation through tracking ICANN meeting and remote attendance, as well as public comment analysis.
Engage in capacity building at a regional level to engage and develop the community globally for ICANN involvement.	Engage in capacity building at all levels. The BC has reservations of the frequent and varied use of the word 'regional' at ICANN. It will need to be carefully explained. At present, there is extremely limited interaction by the new Regional VPs with the current structures of Constituencies/SGs.	Record and report on capacity building activity and number of participants.

The RySG would like a better understanding of "public responsibility framework", noting that there is no commonly agreed to definition of "global public interest." **Response: This focus area has been modified and refined in response to the feedback received.   See 5.3 – this section has been revised and expanded, including outcomes and measures.**

The RySG: "We are fully supporting of increasing the base of stakeholders within ICANN but think that more clarification is needed with regard to what is meant by 'capacity building'….if 'capacity building' relates to Internet infrastructure, then we think that may be out of scope for ICANN's mission." Furthermore,

"development" seems out of scope of ICANN's mission. **Response: The comment has been noted. "Practice of capacity-building" has been added as an outcome in 1.2.   It is no longer specifically addressed in Focus area 5.**

Community input during 18 November 2013 <u>public session</u> in Buenos Aires:

- Rinalia Abdul Rahim expressed support for developing a world-class public responsibility framework, but does not see the framework in what has been provided. Questioned why the objective is skewed toward capacity building, stating " public responsibility where ICANN is concerned, that's where accountability comes in, where operational excellence comes in as well." **Response: These issues have been addressed through the rewording of the bullet points and through refinement of goals via Outcomes (KSF) and Measures (KPI).**
- Mathieu Weill expressed support for this focus area: "I'm very pleased that I see this as the ICANN corporate social responsibility framework… And by focusing it on inclusion and capacity-building, I think this is relevant for ICANN's strategy and achievable and it is a good point. And don't diversify it too much. Stay focused on those lines and I think that's addressing a key issue, which is within ICANN's interest and in the public interest as well." **Response: The comment has been noted. "Practice of capacity-building" has been added as an outcome in 1.2.   It is no longer specifically addressed in Focus area 5.**
- Kristina Rosette: "certainly the capacity-building is part of the public responsibility, but I think it does, in fact, need to be broader to include the public interest accountability and transparency obligations." **Response: Accountability and Transparency obligations have been included as 5.2 - Promote Ethics, Transparency and Accountability.**
- Kristina Rosette suggested "to avoid the external perception that anything that's not specifically included is automatically excluded." **Response: Comment has been noted.   This concern will be addressed as the focus area goals are refined.**
- Kristina Rosette indicated that "there needs to be a greater emphasis on kind of clarity … and greater cohesiveness of the budget process because I think that has implications both internally and externally, in the sense that, for example, speaking specifically to capacity-building, one of the single biggest budget items for last year was for capacity-building and engagement, but there was no detail… So I think it's important that at some point, in some aspect of the strategic plan, that there really is a focus on the budgeting, the financial planning, the financial accountability and responsibility." **Response: This topic is addressed in the 3.4 – Ensure ICANN's long-term financial stability, sustainability, and accountability.**
- Paul Twomey noted that developments within the intellectual property community within the next 12 – 24 months could present a challenge to the definition of what is ICANN's public responsibility. " I would just flag as one of the things that potentially you may want to start thinking about is not just from the position of ICANN but potentially in the supporting organizations and elsewhere, do people -- are people going to have a view on whether the present system is the right system or whether there should be some other system? And so I -- again, what is your public responsibility when these sort of issues emerge?" **Response: The comment has been noted and it is anticipated that the Strategy Panels will help inform this.**
- Mark Carvell, United Kingdom government, representative on the GAC stated "You might want to reference specifically Internet communities and small island states rather than focus solely on developing countries in

terms of capacity-building. My other point is I -- you rightly underline participation and process, but what about opportunities created by the evolution of the domain name system?...That is an issue that has to be addressed with future rounds, and so you might want to specify that as well: understand, participate, and engage in the opportunities." **Response: Comment has been noted. In the process of operationalizing the Strategic Plan, there will be further refinement and definitions of developing countries and regions. This focus area has been updated based on feedback received.**

- Kavouss Arasteh suggested replacing "world-class" with a more clear term. **Response: This term has been removed.**
- Olga Madruga-Forti agreed that "world-class" needs to be clarified. **Response: This term has been removed.**
- Kavouss Arasteh suggested adding two words to " Support developing communities through programs that will enable them to **better** understand and **further** participate in the ICANN process and the multistakeholder model" **Response: This has been addressed in the Outcome section for 5.3**.
- Kavouss Arasteh suggested that a clarification be considered of "developing countries: "perhaps you should mention developing and least developed country." **Response: The term "developing countries" has been changed to "under-represented countries and communities."**
- Kavouss Arasteh suggested that "regional level" be clarified in "Engage in capacity building…""**at various levels including regional and subregional"** **Response: Comment has been noted. The intention is that "regional strategy" includes engaging locally, identifying issues with local significance/impact, addressing the needs of local community, etc.**

FOCUS AREA III:
Supporting a healthy unique identified ecosystem

The ALAC: focus areas paragraph should include "with a secure and trusted DNS" each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. **Response: These concepts are specifically articulated in Vision and Mission**.

The BC: Given the stated Vision and Mission, both of which talk first and foremost about the 'secure and stable operation of the global system of unique identifiers', the BC cannot imagine an operating plan of any kind where this did not remain a priority. **Response: See Focus Area II "Continue to support a healthy, stable and resilient unique identifier ecosystem."   In terms of priority, the importance of prioritization has been noted and in line with the request from the Board, prioritization/ranking will be addressed as public comment is received on the strategic focus area goals and the Draft Plan is finalized.**

The BC suggests replacing "Supporting" with "Maintaining" or "Enabling" in the Focus Area title. **Response: Wording has been adjusted to reflect this "Continue to support a healthy, stable and resilient unique identifier ecosystem."**

The BC provided the following specific input: **Response: This input was considered in refining focus area goals and developing outcomes and measurements.**

Focus Area Goals	Business Constituency Comments
As listed in the Focus Area section of	What are the specific outcomes or achievements we should target for this effort?

	the draft	
	Foster and coordinate a secure, stable and resilient identifier ecosystem, including the stable, secure, trusted operation of the DNS.	We suggest making this goal more precise by replacing it with specific goals around security, stability, and resiliency. With respect to concrete steps to implement these goals, ICANN should consider: -- Support for training and informational sessions for communities of relevance (DNS providers, registries, registrars, hosting companies, ISPs, IXPs) in collaboration with community experts and resources regarding best practices; and -Increased enforcement actions against those who fail to comply with security and stability policies. --Hiring additional staff with expertise in this area. -Focus on developing country ICT associations and consortia that can demonstrate sustainable collaboration initiatives --Publishing informational and compliance metrics in this area. --To Improve the uniformity and consistency of implementation of the UDRP across UDR providers and to eliminate bias". For the measurement criteria - conducting an outside, expert audit/white paper reviewing the implementation of the UDRP and then making specific policy changes based on the findings of the audit/white paper review.
	Plan for emerging changes in the use of domain names and other identifiers.	The BC suggests that this goal should be clarified, as it is not clear what is meant by "emerging changes." However, one important component of meeting this goal will be to forecasting actual use-changes are for domain names, IP Addresses and protocol ports. The BC suggests that ICANN execute a forecasting study and use those results to refine this goal and the tactics for implementing it, while taking care not to promote, or act as an advoritial /promoter of particular approaches. To maintain its role as a trusted steward of the DNS, ICANN needs to return to a more neutral approach in conveying information, including risks and threats in the information provided, not just 'opportunity' promotion.
	Develop a technology roadmap for domain names and other identifiers to help guide ICANN activities and inform the Internet ecosystem.	The Business Constituency believes that this roadmap will be a component of developing a plan for emerging changes in the domain space, as such, should be subsumed in the discussion of the previous goal.
	Develop a technology roadmap for ICANN and security operations to support the operational stability, reliability, resiliency, security, and global interoperability of the DNS.	The Business Constituency strongly supports this goal and suggests that it should be the first priority under this focus area. Note that an important part of both this roadmap and the overall plan for adapting to emerging changes in the domain name space is building a contingency plan for risks, threats, breaches and failures.
	Coordinate a responsible opening of the DNS for "creative disruption" and innovation.	The advent of such a massive number of new gTLDs is a big change in the DNS. The impact of this change on the stability and resiliency of the DNS should be studied and assessed. ICANN has a duty to undertake such a

	study when 100 new gTLDs are live in the root. A linkage back to this kind of accountability needs to be reflected in the Strategic Plan, including metrics for failure by the staff and Board to fulfill the accountability requirement.
Support the evolution of the domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted.	The BC has long supported this as a core priority for ICANN and has incorporated this in our own mission statement.
Support the attainment of broad-scale adoption and operation of IPv6 throughout the Internet.	The BC agrees that IPv6 adoption should be a key priority for ICANN as should maintaining a stable, predictable IPv4 environment, as IPv4 networks are not disappearing, and must co exist.

The RySG expressed a concern about scope creep: "If other identifiers refers to identifiers that ICANN currently coordinates such as Internet numbers, then say that instead of using the general, wide open term 'other identifiers'. **Response:** **These phrases have been reworded.**

The RySG: "What is meant by opening the DNS? If this means adding new gTLDs, we suggest you say that. We also think that it would be good to explain what is meant by 'creative disruption' because this is a term that has not been used much in the community." **Response:** **These phrases have been reworded.**

Community input during 18 November 2013 public session in Buenos Aires:

- Kavouss Arasteh commented regarding "develop technology" suggesting that one cannot develop technology, but instead develop a technique or a roadmap and questioned what is meant by "responsible opening of the DNS." **Response:** **Wording has been changed to "develop technology roadmap."**
- Marilyn Cade commented that "ICANN is creating extensive negative externalities that affect those who actually build and run the Internet…. we have to also assume responsibility for how the parties who are affected and adjust to those." She offered as examples "The negative externalities that we created in the new gTLD program included the impact which led to the creation of the trademark clearinghouse. Another negative externality that we've created are name collisions." **Response:** **Comment has been noted.**
- Chuck Gomes commented that the reference to "other identifiers" in the second bullet may appear to be "mission creep." **Response:** **This was addressed during the public session by Ram Mohan: "Well, I don't think there is a conspiracy to expand. But it is really focused on the mission that is quite well-defined."**
- Ray Plzak remarked that the second bullet highlights a drafting bias toward GNSO "and not to think about the other organizations that happen to be around, like the ccNSO and the ASO." **Response:** **The wording has been revised.**

FOCUS AREA IV: Striving towards technical and operational excellence	The ALAC: focus areas paragraph should include "with a secure and trusted DNS" each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. **Response:** **These concepts are specifically articulated in Vision and Mission.**

The **BC** believes this focus area is vital to support ICANN's role to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers and ensure the stable and secure operation these systems. As the Internet grows and evolves, ICANN, its staff and the community must learn and adapt to direct and support changes in a structured, organized and predictable manner. **Response: This is critical foundational work on which ICANN is focused.**

The **BC** also notes that IANA has been dropped from the title of the focus area but management of IANA function should remain a key strategic objective.
Response: IANA function is an outcome - covered by "Globalized ICANN's operational functions."

The **BC** provided the following specific input: **Response: This input was considered in refining focus area goals and developing outcomes and measures.**

Focus Area Goals *As listed in the Focus Area section of the draft*	Outcomes *What are the specific outcomes or achievements we should target for this effort?*	Measures *What quantitative / qualitative elements should we consider in measuring progress / results?*
Improve the <u>technical sophistication</u> of ICANN staff and stakeholders, and ensure structured coordination of ICANN's technical resources.	• Continuous improvement of systems, processes, and people. • Support of operational growth and evolution, underpinned by technology (i.e. minimum effort in, maximum value out). *Note: the level of sophistication required will differ between ICANN staff as well as stakeholders. This should be balanced by the need to perform specific roles and the level of knowledge required to manage governance aspects and future developments/innovation.*	• Operational performance against SLAs. • Usage of educational tools and feedback regarding same. • Adoption of standards and best practices (e.g. DNSSEC). • Identification of new solutions to improve systems, tools, processes to support priorities. • Post-implementation reviews, including comparisons of actual implementation against implementation plans.
Develop a <u>culture of knowledge and expertise</u> by attracting top talent to staff and the community.	• Motivation and people development. *Note: ICANN should not ignore opportunities for organic growth within the organization, through staff development, motivation and progression planning. It's not just about attracting top talent, it must also be about 'retaining' talent.*	• Recruitment successes. • Staff retention/turnover. • Staff informational sessions to strengthen understanding about ICANN's functions and unique bottom up multistakeholder processes, including the leading role of the community, versus staff driven approach. • Community engagement/input (particularly new engagement).

Create role clarity for the Board, staff and stakeholders.	• Clear roles, responsibilities and accountabilities to maximize productivity and develop optimal structures. • Encourage the right people to fulfill the right roles.	• Defined roles and responsibilities. • Strengthen the understanding of the staff at all levels about the roles and functions performed by the multi stakeholder participants in the Internet and within ICANN.
Ensure ICANN's long-term financial stability and sustainability.	• Stable foundation with forward-looking approach and capabilities. • Support operational growth and evolution. • Maintain secure and stable operations.	• Financial plans for medium-long term, aligned to operational plans and strategy. • Improve support to the organizational structures, such as Constituencies/SGs/and GAC. • Positive balance sheet. • Periodic review of progress against plans.
Ensure a strong linkage between ICANN's Strategic Plan, Operating Plan (with measurable objectives), and Budget.	• Ensure that staff and community efforts align with the operating plans, budget and overall strategy.	• Periodic reporting of progress against strategic plan. • Transparent processes defined, documented and followed to achieve goals.

The RySG suggested two additional bullet points:
- "ICANN seeks to be fiscally responsible in using community resources, i.e., using community provided funds in a cost effective manner, one where value-add justifies the amount spent."
- "Funds intended for specific purposes shall not be commingled with general operational funds."

Response: These concepts have been clarified and are now reflected in outcomes and measures of 3.4 "Ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountability, stability and sustainability."

Community input during 18 November 2013 public session in Buenos Aires:

- Roelof Meijer: "May I recommend that there is an order, especially in the focus areas, and that the first one, the highest priority goes to operational excellence? Because it's kind of a precondition for the other ones, I think. At least to be successful in the other areas." **Response: The importance of prioritization has been noted and in line with the request from the Board, prioritization/ranking will be addressed as public comments are received and the strategic focus area goals are finalized.**
- Mathieu Weill: " I echo Roelof's comment earlier that these should definitely be ICANN's number one priority because it basically underlies everything else that you're doing." **Response: The importance of prioritization has been noted and in line with the request from the Board, prioritization/ranking will be addressed as public comments are received and the strategic focus area goals are finalized.**
- Mathieu Weill highlighted two missing elements. One - that very little was included about the people

	working at ICANN and that the bullet should be rephrased from "a culture of knowledge and expertise" to " a culture of facilitation, of accountability and of achieving results…. change the second bullet into defining what the culture of ICANN should be in the future and having the leadership to transform the culture of the organization into this." Two – "excellence is about people, systems, and processes, and you need processes." **Response: Accountability is how ICANN serves the public interest and serving the public interest and has been incorporated in the Vision. Accountability is reflected in Public Responsibility focus area – "Promote ethics, transparency and accountability."** • Kavouss Arasteh suggested changing the word "budget" to "financial plan". **Response: Has been reworded.** • Kavouss Arasteh questioned the meaning of "create role clarity for the board." As written the statement implies that either there is no role or there is no clarity. He suggested rewording using "foster and improve". He also suggested that the word "sophistication" in the first bullet be replaced with improve technical capacity, technical capability and technical knowledge. **Response: This goal has been further clarified and refined by defining Outcomes (KSF) and Measures (KPI) – 3.3 "Create role clarity for the board, staff and stakeholders."** • Rohit Thomas commented about the importance of including a strategic goal of mitigation of risk, suggesting "a completely new bullet is needed to introduce a concept of enterprise risk management to ensure the operational and technical excellence is managed and maintained in a sustainable manner." **Response: The Strategic Plan has been expanded to include Outcomes, Risks, Measures and Phasing. The risks that have been identified in connection with strategies have been considered and will continue to be integrated into Enterprise-wide Risk Management.** • Kavouss Arasteh echoed the importance of risk mitigation. **Response: The Strategic Plan has been expanded to include Outcomes, Risks, Measures and Phasing. The risks that have been identified in connection with strategies have been considered and will continue to be integrated into Enterprise-wide Risk Management.** • Roelof Meijer suggested that references to "stakeholders" and "community" in the first and second bullet point do not belong within this section and should be included in the internationalization and improvement of the multistakeholder model. **Response: The wording has been revised.**
FOCUS AREA V: Defining role clarity for ICANN in the Internet governance ecosystem	The ALAC: focus areas paragraph should include "with a secure and trusted DNS" each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. **Response: These concepts are specifically articulated in Vision and Mission.** The BC supports a narrowly focused technical coordination role and mission for ICANN. In particular, a limited mission for ICANN is its best defense against detractors. However, through the efforts of all participants in the ICANN community, ICANN can and should serve as an example and model for transparent, bottom-up, multi-stakeholder decision-making. ICANN should also fully support and participate in directly relevant activities, such as the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), national and regional IGF initiatives, and similar activities which affect ICANN's ability to fulfill its mission, drawing on input and collaboration within its own stakeholders. **Response: Comment has been noted and the substance has been incorporated in the Vision and strategies.** The BC provided the following specific input: **Response: This input was considered in refining focus area goals**

and developing outcomes and measures.

Focus Area Goals *As listed in the Focus Area section of the draft*	Outcomes *What are the specific outcomes or achievements we should target for this effort?*	Measures *What quantitative / qualitative elements should we consider in measuring progress / results?*
Clarify ICANN's role with respect to the coordination of the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers to ensure we keep pace with an evolving Internet ecosystem, including in key areas relating to: consumers, security, compliance / regulatory, public interest, business innovation, and intellectual property rights.	Develop more useful and clear informational materials that describe ICANN's work and functions. Maintain ongoing engagement with ICANN's community of stakeholders	
Ensure ICANN's role is clear, recognized, and well understood worldwide.	Develop and support the use of approved messages and informational materials	
Create a balanced and proactive approach to engagement with communities dependent on the domain name system.	ICANN will hopefully shift from a supplier focus to a more balanced set of relationships that includes representatives of users of the DNS/	
Create a balanced and proactive approach to engagement with governments.	Increase the participation of governmental representatives in ICANN meetings, Collaborate with its own community of stakeholders regarding engagement with governmental representatives, and in other identified fora where ICANN's functions and roles are discussed or debated	
Facilitate an issues-based cooperation and problem-solving environment.		
Develop a stable framework for Internet governance.	ICANN is not solely responsible for IG, and should strive to be a collaborator, working with others, including its own community, other internationally focused for a, IGOs, ICANN should foster a co-existence and collaborative approach, including helping to support increased participation by all parties in its own mechanisms, and contributing to funding of participation of all stakeholders into other key fora, such as IGF, national and regional IGF initiatives,	
Foster cooperation, fairness, communication and trust among the IG ecosystem.	Increased support by ICANN to participation support for participants from developing countries from all stakeholders, including SMEs and business associations and organizations from	

	developing countries.	
Engage in and <u>highlight complementary relationships</u>; be stronger together.	Improve internal consultation with ICANN's stakeholder community. Ensure that mechanisms that ICANN is 'generating' or supporting include sufficient representation from its own community.	Outputs or outcome documents from any initiatives which ICANN advances must include consultation with the ICANN community.

<u>The RySG</u> suggested that individual user rights be added, since intellectual property rights are listed. **Response: This comment has been noted. End-users are included and referenced in the narrative preceding several focus areas, and are incorporated in the references to the multistakeholder approach and processes.**
The RySG further suggested that the term "consumer" be replaced with "domain name and number holders" or "Internet users in general" in order to "avoid any implication that ICANN should be a consumer protection agency, something that some in the community want but something that is outside of ICANN's mission."
Response: This item has been removed.

<u>The RySG</u> expressed full support of "Ensure ICANN's role is clear, recognized, and well understood worldwide."

<u>The RySG</u> recommended adding "as it relates to ICANN's mission." to "Develop a stable framework for Internet governance." **Response: This item has been removed.**

Community input during 18 November 2013 <u>public session</u> in Buenos Aires:
- Chuck Gomes indicated his support for this objective.
- Kavouss Arasteh questioned why accountability is not included. **Response: Accountability is how ICANN serves the public interest and serving the public interest and has been incorporated in the Vision. Accountability is reflected in Public Responsibility focus area – "Promote ethics, transparency and accountability."**
- Roelof Meijer suggested changing the title of this focus area because defining role clarity should not take five years, but other aspects of the work intended in this area will. **Response: This comment has been addressed by changing to "Clarify and establish ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem."**
- Bertrand De La Chapelle suggested that the bullet points as written may be too detailed and implementation-focused, rather than being more strategically oriented. **Response: This comment has been noted and addressed by revising strategies and expanding on Outcomes and Measurements.**

<u>General Comments</u>

The ALAC considers the submitted "ICANN Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan" a comprehensive document addressing all the aspects of a future strategic plan. The ALAC finds the other elements of the focus Areas well expressed and detailed.

Community input during 18 November 2013 public session in Buenos Aires:

- Roelof Meijer suggested that Focus Areas and the objectives within a given Focus Area be prioritized in order of importance: "May I recommend that there is an order, especially in the focus areas, and that the first one, the highest priority goes to operational excellence? Because it's kind of a precondition for the other ones, I think. At least to be successful in the other areas." **Response: The importance of prioritization has been noted and in line with the request from the Board, prioritization/ranking will be addressed as public comments are received and the strategic focus area goals are finalized.**

- Kavouss Arasteh disagreed with prioritization: "as far as I'm concerned, it doesn't matter what is all the priority and it is better you do not mention all the priorities because in view of some people Item 3 is order one, some others Item 2 some is order 1." **Response: Based on the direction from the Board as well as other feedback received, phasing of strategic work has been incorporated into the Strategic Plan.**

- Chris Chaplow from Andalucia.com questioned how to get from the previous strategic plan of four focus areas to the current five focus areas, indicating that a mapping would be helpful. **Response: Denise Michel provided an overview of the process and the fact that the starting point was NOT the previous strategic plan, but a clean slate.**

- Marcelo Saldanha asked "How can ICANN help develop or influence policy of Internet governance on networks of last mile since programs like digital cities, smart cities and community networks begin to be developed as a way of expanding access to the Internet?" **Response: This question was noted.**