ICANN Strategic Planning Development and 2013-2016 Strategic Plan Formulation
Summary of Community Feedback from Public Comment (4 June – 4 July 2012) and Sessions held in Prague (27 June and 29 June 2012)

ICANN staff would like to thank the community for its participation in the Strategic Planning sessions and for the subsequent comments and feedback. The purpose of this document is to summarize what we have heard via discussions and comments from the two sessions held in Prague. This summary should be considered along with the formal record of the sessions, which can be found at http://prague44.icann.org/node/31751 and http://prague44.icann.org/node/31677 and the comments received in the Public Comment forum for Request for Community Input (http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/stratplan2013-04jun12-en.htm).

The feedback from the community centered on the following topics:
- o A proposal for the formation of a cross-constituency strategic planning working group
- o The proposed Strategic Planning Timeline
- o Linkage to the Operating Plan and Budget
- o Strategic Plan content

Proposed cross-constituency strategic planning working group (WG)
The community expressed support for the idea of forming a cross-constituency strategic planning working group and offered the following suggestions:
1. As community members would need to organize their representatives in order to be able to take ideas to their communities and get their communities' feedback, it is important that the strategic planning timeline allows ample time for such organization and activities.
2. Because other WGs already exist, it would be useful to understand their purpose and charter and how they relate to the strategic planning process to avoid duplication and overlap.
3. ICANN staff should consider the structure of the various constituencies to ensure that all community segments are invited to participate.
4. The WG should have an explicit charter, mission, goals, duration, and membership – all clearly defined and documented.
5. The WG does not replace the need for greater public participation in the strategic planning process.

ICANN's response:
- o We agree with the need to review and take stock of all WGs, including their purpose, charter, participants and current projects/work. The management will consider the most effective way to ensure that the entire community is represented via a cross-constituency WG concept.
- o The Strategic Planning team is collaborating with the Finance team in order to ensure linkage between the Strategic Plan and the Operating Plan and Budget.

- We will develop a plan for the formation of the WG and publish it in time for the implementation of the 2014-2017 Planning Cycle.

Proposed Strategic Planning Timeline
There was an expression of concern that the timeline was too aggressive and did not provide adequate time for the formation of the WG as well as other substantive strategic planning work, such as environmental analysis, vision and strategic direction.

We proposed the idea of creating a planning cycle that would include two years of "interim update of the strategic plan" with one year of a "full-scale strategic planning effort". Feedback to date is generally supportive of this idea.

ICANN response:
- The timeline is being recalibrated in accordance with the community feedback, along with direction from ICANN's new CEO.
- We are focused on developing a strategic and operating planning process that will be consistent and predictable.

Linkage to the Operating Plan and Budget
Support was expressed for the concept of creating a bottom up approach to building key deliverables and metrics, using the Operating Plan and Budget. Furthermore, participants felt that it would be helpful to organize strategic initiatives based on the expected time to complete: short-term (12 months) vs. long-term (longer than 12 months), with the expectation that short-term initiatives would coincide with the Operating Plan and Budget. A request was submitted to categorize expenditures by mission area.
1. Community representative asked whether the Strategic Plan would mandate that key deliverables and metrics be set up for each strategic activity.
2. In order to create linkage between the Strategic Plan and the Operating Plan and Budget, timing of the drafting and approval process needs to be reviewed.

ICANN response:
- The Strategic Planning team has collaborated with the Finance team in the work currently underway by the Finance Ad Hoc Community Groups (https://community.icann.org/display/projfinadhocws/Finance+Ad+Hoc+Community+Groups+Workspace) in order to ensure linkage between the Strategic Plan and the Operating Plan and Budget.
- We are drafting priorities and initiatives for FY 2014 to be considered by the Board and community during September and October. These priorities and initiatives will be used as inputs into the Operating Plan and Budget.

o The planning timeline being developed considers the key milestones, including Operating Plan and Budget Framework (January) Draft Operating Plan and Budget (May) and Approved Operating Plan and Budget (June).

Strategic Plan Content
Feedback was provided on the specific wording of the plan content as well as on the broader topics, such as environmental analysis, vision and strategic direction.

1. The strategic plan should clearly express the vision of ICANN.
2. It is important to consider external environmental forces, such as whether domain names will continue to be an integral part of the Internet or if that will change with developments in technology and online usage.
3. ICANN should consider assembling statistical information to create a "picture" of the Internet and how it's changing and evolving.
4. "Globalization" in a broad sense, defined as a way of thinking, should be incorporated into the strategic plan, possibly in the one-page summary. Given that ICANN is a global entity, further expression of how the idea of globalization is reflected in each of the four strategic pillars should be considered.
5. Stakeholder Groups (SG) is a more descriptive term than SO/ACs.
6. Consider expanding the bullet points and abbreviated phrases with language that better expresses the thoughts and depth of intended ideas.
7. A recommendation was made to organize trends and events of importance by categories, to the extent feasible (i.e. technical, non-technical, internal, external). Also, it would be useful to note who is triggering the event and what the significance is.
8. DNS Stability and Security
   a. DNS Security and Stability Analysis (DSSA) methodology will provide useful inputs.
   b. Include Source Address Validation as a significant event for the DNS Security and Stability pillar.
   c. "Increasing demand for training and capability building" should be expanded to include a broader definition of groups to be educated, including stakeholders and community. It should also reflect the possibility that new structures may be needed within the supporting organizations to accommodate the needs of the broader and more diverse group of stakeholders.
9. The community offered a diverse perspective on what constitutes appropriate wording for the pillar currently named, "A healthy Internet governance eco-system."
   a. While some felt that the word "governance" should be removed, others expressed that "governance" carries an agreed upon meaning and should be included in the title of the pillar.

       b. ICANN needs to drive and support a governance system that is broader than ICANN.

ICANN's response:
- o We will take into account the suggested wording changes and clarifications.

Community participation and comments:

Participants in Prague Sessions	Community Group
Carlton Samuels	At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr	At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
Olivier Crépin-Leblond	At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
Branislav Andjelic	Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)
Leonid Todorov	Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoeben	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Commercial Stakeholder Group
Chris Chaplow	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Commercial Stakeholder Group
John Berard	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Commercial Stakeholder Group
Mark Partridge	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Intellectual Property Constituency
David Cake	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
Alain Berranger	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns
Keith Drazek	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Registry Stakeholder Group
Marilyn Cade	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Business Constituency
John Berard	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Business Constituency
Paul McGrady	INTA subcommittee on Internet Governance and Contractual Relationships
Valer Mischenko	NLnet Foundation
Patrik Fältström	Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Comments were received from the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), Michael A. Norton (Founder & CEO, .fed Registry Services, LLC) and John Curran (President & CEO, American Registry for Internet Numbers). Comments can be accessed at http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/stratplan2013-04jun12-en.htm.