nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
1	1	Larry Masinter	In the area of global unique identifiers, there are two areas where a relatively small investment would go a long way toward the security and governance of unique identifier systems. a) 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, using, commenting, reviewing those registries are cumbersome compared to the alternatives (WikiPedia, Open Source registries, etc.) I'd suggest as a strategic management of IANA should include some effort to survey the uses, select additional technology, analyze the transparency and effectiveness of the registration methods. I think I would include MIME types and URI schemes, but also look at requirements of communities that currently maintain Internet-wide registries outside of IANA.	Support, with edits	The strategic plan focuses on a desired state ("the "what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
2	1 & 2	Larry Masinter	b) Aids to use of IDN. The current focus on TLD selection in ICANN priorities for IDN development should be expended to include a focus on other barriers to actual USE of IDNs embedded in other globally unique identifiers, including email addresses and URLs. In particular, someone choosing components of an identifier needs some way of easily assessing the usability of the entire identifier for the full range of uses of that identifier, including comparison, recognition, and transcription. There is a gap between the development of TLD rules and the actual end-users that should be addressed in the timeframe of this strategic plan. s/expended/expanded/ Although expanding will increase expenditure.	Support, with edits	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 edited to acknowledge the collective efforts needed to support this goal.	Yes	p.18
3	3	James Gannon	Most notably i will 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 suspect that this document was created by asking the department heads to generate their own risks and objectives and not created in a cross functional manner.) This has resulted in a strongly tactical focus within what should be a strategic document, and given some of the enduring fundamental misunderstandings that are present (ICANN vs PTI) I suggest a rework and resubmit for public comment is likely warranted.	Other suggestion	The introduction section of the strategic plan has been edited to provide more clarity into the methodology and process followed for the development of this strategic plan.	Yes	p. 3
4	3	James Gannon	No comment on the substance however I would suggest reworking the outcomes and risks to have planer language, in vogue phrases such as thought leadership and cyber warfare should be avoided in long term strategic planning as these phrases can evolve over time.	Support, with edits	Replaced "thought leaders" with "relevant parties" and replaced "cyberwarfare" with "information warfare".	Yes	p. 9 & 12
5	3	James Gannon	The association of DNSSEC deployment and alternative roots is not grounded in any strong factual basis that I am aware of. Alt roots are certainly an area that needs to be tracked and root server cooperation is important however the strategic risks associated with 1.2 should be revisited.	Support, with edits	The risk has been edited to remove the association of DNSSEC deployment and alternative roots.	Yes	p. 10
6	3	James Gannon	I agree that more strategic focus on the KSK and KMF processes is a appropriate. Close integration of this area with the RZM is extremely important, I suggest that a separate paper on this topic is likely warranted to define the RZM and Root Zone Key strategy for the same time period due to the tri party arrangement (ICANN, PTI,VRSN)	Support	The PTI Bylaws mandate the development of a separate Strategic Plan to cover the IANA functions. We invite you to follow the development of this plan, which will begin in the coming months.	No	
7	3	James Gannon	Given the timescale currently being experienced within IPv6 deployment, ICANN should and must have a more defined strategic goal on its expected future investments vs pushing further adoption via 3rd parties	Concern	The goal and its related outcomes have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.	Yes	p.18
8	3	James Gannon	Emerging Technologies requires definition, ICANN has a limited remit to ensure coordination of the DNS and internet identifiers. Where emerging technologies intersect with that must be defined at this strategic level or we risk this document becoming a tactical plan.	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit #86 & 132. Also addresses comment #8.	Yes	p. 17 & p. 19
9	3	James Gannon	ICANN does not deliver the IANA functions, this section should be moved to a PTI document.	Concern	ICANN's Bylaws obligate it to establish an entity for the performance of the IANA functions, and for ICANN to serve as the sole member of that entity. In addition, ICANN's Bylaws also obligate it to have a contract 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 both in ICANN's Strategic Plan as well as providing operational details on that work in the affiliate's documentation.	No	
10	3	James Gannon	The outcomes for this section are statement of fact or hope, with no SMART aspects, this section needs to be rewritten to be actual objectives in order to be operationalised.	Concern	The outcomes of goal 3.4 have been edited to clarify conditions for success.	Yes	p. 21
11	3	James Gannon	If this goal is to be achieved it needs to be understood that this function and goal needs to be targeted by professionals as their core responsibility. The current approach of reusing existing staff members without experience in this area has resulted (Despite their works) in a fragmented and unstructured approach that is largely ineffective. If this is to be a strategic goal in the org then this needs to be reflected in budgeting (Which it has not been for the current FY2020 documents available)	Other suggestion	The strategic plan, along with the 5-yr operating and financial plan are the founding documents that will drive the development of ICANN's budget for that period.	No	
12	3	James Gannon	Please see above comments on 4.1 [If this goal is to be achieved it needs to be understood that this function and goal needs to be targeted by professionals as their core responsibility. The current approach of reusing existing staff members without experience in this area has resulted (Despite their works) in a fragmented and unstructured approach that is largely ineffective. If this is to be a strategic goal in the org then this needs to be reflected in budgeting (Which it has not been for the current FY2020 documents available)]	Other suggestion	The strategic plan, along with the 5-yr operating and financial plan are the founding documents that will drive the development of ICANN's budget for that period.	No	
13	3	James Gannon	This objective seems at odds with itself. ICANN needs to become more agile and flexible, however a move to a 2 year planning cycle is proposed. I would in fact suggest the opposite, design more agile planning methods to move to an agile strategic management plan where financial changes can be processed within a less than 12 month timeframe.	Concern	The goal on planning (now 5.1) and associated outcomes have been edited to be more aligned.	Yes	p. 25 & 26
14	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	The most crucial item is the identification of real and elementary community needs based on bottom up Model which will help to reach consensus about new processes in acceptable duration.	Other suggestion	The goals under section #2 on ICANN's governance, and the associated targeted outcomes and risks have been edited to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.	Yes	p. 13 to 16
15	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	Why limited to policy development cross-community working groups should also care about technical and financial aspects	Support, with edits	The corresponding outcome has been edited to be more inclusive of all aspects of governance.	Yes	p. 14
16	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	Ensure that SO and ACs members are effectively representative of their respective communities.	Other suggestion	The notion of representation is covered under Goal 2.3, and its first outcome seems to cover this comment. ("Representation across all stakeholders continues to reflect the evolving functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet.") No changes made.	No	
17	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	Review the model to reduce decisions making cycle duration by engaging real and more specific community representative stackholder to avoid fictive stackholder. In all cases ICANN should have the ability to alternate between governance Models because in some cases (technical issue or in some regions where government is the main actor) the application of the multistakeholder it is a waste of time.	Other suggestion	The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired state ("the "what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
18	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	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 guarantee balance of regional representation in addition of technical skills.	Other suggestion	ICANN's Geographic Regions underwent a multi-year review. A Final Report of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group was published in 2015, https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en. The Report established that ICANN's geographic diversity is valuable and must be preserved. The report recommends that ICANN's structures and processes lower barriers for participation and engagement by community members as much as practicable. The Board considered this Final Report in October 2018 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-10-25-en#2.b) and directed ICANN org to implement the report.	No	
19	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	Focus on Academia in less technology developed country in order to spread basic knowledge and to give the opportunity to community to join Universal Acceptance efforts, Encourage collaboration between countries of the same region by sharing mutual success experience.	Other suggestion	ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement team does have an Academia outreach plan and regularly supports engagement activities with academic institutions at a regional level, to spread awareness of ICANN and topics related to the DNS including Universal Acceptance.	No	
20	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	Less expensive if ICANN acquire the ability to adopt its mission and activities according to some local, regional legislations.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
21	4	Chokri Ben Romdhane	Seeking alternatives in the region where the DNS market outcomes is down.	Other suggestion	Seeking alternative funding models is not in ICANN's strategy at this time.	No	
22	5	NRO	[Amend] to reflect that work on these goals with respect to Internet Number Resources should be coordinated with the RIRs.	Support, with edits	The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.	Yes	p. 17
23	5	NRO	[Amend] to reflect that work on these goals with respect to Internet Number Resources should be coordinated with the RIRs.	Support, with edits	The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.	Yes	p. 17
24	5	NRO	[Amend] to reflect that work on these goals with respect to Internet Number Resources should be coordinated with the RIRs.	Support, with edits	The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.	Yes	p. 17
25	6	ccNSO-SOPC	We would like to compliment ICANN for making available clear explanations about the relevance of each of its five strategic objectives. However, it is less clear how ICANN tested the appropriateness of the proposed Strategic Goals with regards to the Strategic Objective: there is no indication of other goals that may have been considered, or what criteria determined the goals that have been approved. A strong logical chain from the Targeted Outcomes to the Strategic Goal is not always apparent. Targeted Outcomes are the 'strategy' of the plan, articulating how specific goals will be achieved. However, because they described only in single sentences, it is difficult to ascertain ICANN's reasoning for why those outcomes are the best for the established goal(s).	Other suggestion	Targeted outcomes are a measure of success, not an articulation of how goals will be achieved. The introduction has been edited to better introduce the ceoncepts of targeted outcomes and strategic risks.	Yes	p. 3
26.1	6	ccNSO-SOPC	ICANN should be commended for acknowledging a drastically evolved external environment, which necessitates a revision of its strategic priorities. Equally commendable is ICANN's readiness to listen to the community and incorporate its input as major components in the strategic document.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
26.2	6	ccNSO-SOPC	What seems to be missing is a reference to the notion of stewardship.	Other suggestion	The notion of stewardship was already present in the overall vision: "by being the independent, trusted, multi-stakeholder steward of the Internet's unique identifiers". It's being also reinforced by the proposed addition of "in the stewardship" in the first bullet point "Secure operational excellence..." No additional change necessary.	No	
26.3	6	ccNSO-SOPC	Furthermore, in the absence of a specific interpretation of the concept of 'global public interest', it would be wise to refrain from its usage or have it be accompanied by strictly-defined qualifications.	Other suggestion	ICANN's role to serve the global public interest is a key aspect of all work done and decisions made. For this first paragraph of the introduction section of the Strategic Plan, we concur that reference more generally to acting within ICANN's mission is appropriate.	Yes	p. 3 & p. 14
27	6	ccNSO-SOPC	We have no comments regarding ICANN's mission and find it comprehensive and exhaustive. We also particularly welcome paragraph 1.1.(b) holding that 'ICANN shall not act outside its Mission', which this group has advocated at length.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
28	6	ccNSO-SOPC	We would appreciate a definition of 'DNS stakeholders';	Other suggestion	The multistakeholder model does not preclude anyone from participating, so the notion of stakeholder must remain broad and inclusive of all, so we are reluctant to any definition that could be limiting.	No	
29	6	ccNSO-SOPC	Targeted Outcomes under 1.1. reads, 'ICANN, in partnership with DNS stakeholders, establishes a coordinated approach to effectively identify and mitigate DNS security threats and combat DNS abuse'. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to replace the verb 'establishes' with 'promotes';	Support, with edits	It seemed important to make sure that an approach is defined, prior to promoting it, hence the addition, rather than a substitution.	Yes	p. 9
30	6	ccNSO-SOPC	The Strategic Risks item, 'The single, interoperable Internet is threatened if the entrenched DNS fails to evolve' should top the list, as it is the greatest and most universal risk of all.	Support, with edits	This strategic risk was moved under goal 3.2, as it relates more to the evolution of the unique identifiers system than to the security.	Yes	p. 9
31	6	ccNSO-SOPC	As for Strategic Goal 1.2., in the box Strategic Risks, the item 'Governmental interest in stronger control over the Internet and cybersecurity could influence DNS root server governance structures' should top the list	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 10
32	6	ccNSO-SOPC	As for Strategic Goal 1.2., in the box Strategic Risks, [...] the item 'The lack of an accountable governance structure could lead to insufficiency in DNS root service, potentially encouraging the development of alternative DNS root services' should be updated to read 'The lack of an accountable collaborative private-sector-led governance structure could lead to insufficiency in DNS root service, potentially encouraging certain actors to attempt to develop alternative DNS root services'	Support, with edits	The risk (as modified in the revised draft) reflects that the loss of trust is a greater risk factor than the development of alternative roots, which have already been in existence for many years. A loss of trust could cause the consumer to find other services that are more reliable/accountable. The risk has been edited in this sense.	Yes	p. 10
33	6	ccNSO-SOPC	For Strategic Goal 1.3., we recommend avoiding phrases such as 'like DNSSEC within the DNS' in the Targeted Outcome, as they are excessively particular.	Support, with edits	Agree, deleted that phrase.	Yes	p. 11
34	6	ccNSO-SOPC	For Strategic Goal 1.4., we suggest merging the two foremost Targeted Outcomes to read, 'The reliable, resilient, and interoperable DNS remains the leading trusted platform for the Internet's addressing system.'	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 12
35	6	ccNSO-SOPC	The success of the model (real participation of all stakeholders) can also cause its downfall by triggering possible delays in decision-making and having a high threshold for decisions on controversial issues (i.e. it is impossible to align the stakes of all stakeholders);	Other suggestion	The narratives under the section #2 on Governance have been edited to make these considerations more apparent.	No	
36	6	ccNSO-SOPC	The all Objective states what needs to be improved, addressed, strengthened, enhanced and sustained, but gives no clue whatsoever to how this will be achieved.	Other suggestion	The strategic plan focuses on a desired state ("the "what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
37	6	ccNSO-SOPC	It is hard to distinguish the difference between Strategic Goals 2.1., 2.2., and 2.3. Strategic Goal 2.2. states clearly that it is about processes. Strategic Goal 2.3. is about representation, participation and engagement. However, Strategic Goal 2.1. (looking closely at the Targeted Outcomes) includes prioritization as well as processes and representation. Either there is no need for three Objectives (two would suffice), or the wording should be improved to reflect their intended meaning.	Support, with edits	The goals under section #2 on ICANN's governance, and the associated targeted outcomes and risks have been edited to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.	Yes	p. 13 to 16
38	6	ccNSO-SOPC	In the introduction, please correct the typo by inserting a space to read 'interoperable infrastructure'.	Other suggestion	Thanks for flagging. Typo was corrected.	Yes	p.17
39	6	ccNSO-SOPC	Regarding Strategic Goal 3.2., three out of the four Strategic Risks effectively involve Governments defying the concept of single, interoperable Internet by developing alternative root-server arrangements. This does not seem entirely consistent with the wording of the Goal per se. As such, we recommend that the wording be checked and amended to identify more relevant risks;	Other suggestion	Though each of the bulleted risks could be influenced by governments, they are all independent of them as well.	No	
40	6	ccNSO-SOPC	The Targeted Outcome of Strategic Goal 3.3. reads, 'ICANN promotes and supports awareness of the IANA functions to successfully maintain the broad array of Internet unique identifiers and deliver effective DNS root zone operations'. This is too general. For greater clarity and specificity, it should include the words 'among stakeholders'; that is, 'ICANN promotes and supports awareness of the IANA functions among stakeholders to successfully maintain the broad array of Internet unique identifiers and deliver effective DNS root zone operations.'	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit.	Yes	p. 20
41	6	ccNSO-SOPC	Regarding Strategic Goal 3.4., in the Targeted Outcome box, the second item could be updated to read as follows: 'New gTLDs continue to serve the evolving domain name marketplace and diversity of opportunities for Internet users'.	Support, with edits	The outcomes of goal 3.4 have been edited to clarify conditions for success.	Yes	p. 21
42	6	ccNSO-SOPC	Furthermore, it would be logical to complement the list of Outcomes with the statement, 'The new round of gTLD is a success, with their maxim possible proportion delegated to the root and sustain operation and consistent expansion thereafter.'	Support, with edits	The proposed edit is understtood to reflect that success should be measured by maximum number of delegations to the root zone as well as the continued stable operation of as many of these new TLDs as possible. As ICANN's mission involves maintaining the security and stability of the DNS, it should be clear that the goal is not to delegate as many TLDs as possible; however, the policy basis for the program calls for delegating as many as meet the technical, operational, and financial criteria. With regard to continued and sustained operations in the namespace generally, this is an important goal and has been incorporated in the outcomes.	Yes	p. 21
43	6	ccNSO-SOPC	We support the assessment and inclusion of possible geopolitical issues (and differences), as they do indeed constitute a threat to the stability and success of our industry.	Support	Thank you for your comment.	No	
44	6	ccNSO-SOPC	Few things begin at the global level; most concerns are national or regional. The document mentions relationships with regional organizations. As such, we believe that ICANN could (and should) collaborate more with country code registries to gain information and approaches on issues that begin nationally but have the potential to grow wider.	Other suggestion	Acknowledging the need for collaboration with ccTLDs, the 1st outcome under 4.2 has been edited to include local partners (not just regional and global).	Yes	p.24
45	6	ccNSO-SOPC	In Strategic Goal 4.1., the word 'threats' could reasonably be replaced by 'changes'. ICANN should indeed identify changes that require reaction – but not all of these are threats. A good example is GDPR: it cannot be considered a threat, but ICANN failed nevertheless to react in timely manner.	Support, with edits	The word 'threats' has been replaced with 'challenges and opportunities'.	Yes	p. 22 & 23

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
46	6	ccNSO-SOPC	In Strategic Goal 4.2., the goal itself aims to raise awareness about single, global, interoperable Internet, while the Targeted Outcomes for this goal are focused on ICANN itself (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. focused on raising awareness about the Internet, not only ICANN itself.	Other suggestion	The language for goal 4.2 on page 24 was from an older draft, and was corrected to reflect the language found on page 22. The goal was also edited to clarify the strategic intent.	Yes	p.22 & 24
47	6	ccNSO-SOPC	The three strategic goals, - Enhance ICANN's understanding of the domain name marketplace; - Strengthen cost management and financial accountability mechanisms; - Enhance ICANN's financial planning model, are logical derivates of the Strategic Objective. However, considering ICANN's age, they are slightly alarming. One would expect such goals in a start-up/scale-up phase, but not in a mature, multimillion organization.	Support	Thank you for your comment.	No	
48	6	ccNSO-SOPC	We appreciate reading good planning in phrases such as 'prioritize it work' and 'balance investments'.	Support	Thank you for your comment.	No	
49	6	ccNSO-SOPC	The text provides arguments for its strategic goals, among which the need to replenish the Reserve Fund, and investments in essential technology and security requirements, are valid reasons. 'The growing needs and demands of the global community' are presented as an additional motive. ICANN has a tendency to broaden its fields of involvement and engagement, occasionally without basis in demand. When it does consider both demand and the financial resources available, demand is created. Thus, ICANN should not only consider its income and expenses, but should also be very restrictive with regard to new engagements that involve financial support.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
50	7	ALAC	As the draft Strategic Plan describes, the way the Internet has developed since the last version of the Strategic Plan, especially when it comes to its grown importance to the world's economic, social, and political systems in conjunction with the expansion of its user base, content, and applications, brings an increasing need for reliability, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure. This actually touches on the core of ICANN's mission, which is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. The ALAC therefore agrees this should be the primary strategic objective for ICANN and strongly supports the four strategic goals 1.1 to 1.4 as listed in the draft strategic plan.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
51	7	ALAC	In order to perform the technical remit of ICANN's mission as incorporated into its bylaws, ICANN coordinates the development and implementation of policies with regard to the allocation of IP addresses (numbers) and the assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name System as well as the registration of second-level domain names in generic top-level domains. These policies are developed through a bottom-up, consensus based 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 ICANN as an organization, and it is essential that it works effectively.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
52	7	ALAC	Trade-offs ICANN's unique role in the Internet governance ecosystem demands that it engage with large numbers of stakeholders in a bottom-up process to arrive at agreed upon positions. It is essential to find ways of dealing with this task without restricting the broad based bottom-up consensus input that legitimizes our process. The simple fact that untold numbers of volunteers with no financial stake whatsoever in the process are willing to spend enormous chunks of their personal time to keep this model running is evidence enough that it is filling an important and otherwise unmet need. One of ICANN's great strengths lies in the financial support it is able to offer to bring all these resources to the table. Volunteers are bringing vast resources of time and knowledge to the table and this also needs to be a recognized and valued part of the exchange. We wish to underline the need to be aware of the tradeoffs involved when we seek to introduce cost efficiencies while protecting the principles of accountability and transparency.	Other suggestion	Conciliating seemingly competing goals is the main challenge of this objective on ICANN's governance. The narratives under objective #2 have been edited to make that more apparent.	Yes	p.13
53	7	ALAC	Keep the playing field as level as possible The ALAC maintains an incredible portfolio in that Internet end user implications are not restricted just to the GNSO policy development processes but extends to other parts of the ICANN remit. We are charged by the bylaws to represent the Internet end users and we carry that load in good faith as best we can. At the Internet end user level, participation in this process requires stamina, technical knowledge and political skills. This makes it hard for Internet end users who are impacted by this to find an entry point. It also makes it hard for multistakeholder participants to come together as equals as there are many types of multistakeholder participants - technical experts, paid lobbyists, legal, IT and trademark professionals, and unpaid volunteers learning how to express their views and concerns in a unique and challenging decision-making environment. To maintain the credibility and integrity of the multistakeholder system, special efforts must be made to ensure the inclusion, participation and support of the newcomer/volunteer segment of this model. This is essential to maintain an effective, broadbased decision-making model.	Other suggestion	An additional outcome was added under Goal 2.3 to address this comment ("Continued efforts of ICANN organization, community and Board facilitate the inclusion and participation of all stakeholders.")	Yes	p. 16
54	7	ALAC	Rebalance input at Board level We are concerned about the fact that At-Large, as an Advisory Committee with the power to nominate only a single Board member, does not have enough weight in determining the makeup of the Board to ensure the strong presence of Internet end user perspectives. We feel that ICANN's implementation of the multistakeholder model would be strengthened, were this to be addressed. Given the incredible diversity in the global Internet end user population, a second seat would allow At-Large to nominate Directors with differing backgrounds, geographic origins and lived experiences.	Other suggestion	The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired state ("the what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
55	7	ALAC	Linking objectives to budget There needs to be a strong link between the budget and the objective of improving governance and participation. If the budgets are too restrictive with respect to the needs of multistakeholder partners, those partners will be unable to achieve the targeted outcomes and this will result in a compromise to the credibility and integrity of the multistakeholder system. The link between strengthening the multistakeholder decision making process and the financial ability of SO/ACs, RALOs and other partners to participate needs to be acknowledged.	Other suggestion	A new strategic risk was added under Goal 2.2 to reflect these concerns.	Yes	p. 15
56	7	ALAC	Encourage cooperation We believe the multistakeholder process should always be built upon cooperation between stakeholder groups. We believe that all groups should be adequately resourced to enable them to do the work they are charged to do. Not doing this simply endangers the entire process.	Other suggestion	The narratives of the section on Governance have been edited to make these considerations more apparent.	Yes	p. 13 to 16
57	7	ALAC	Iterative revisiting of priorities for reviews, policy development and decision-making We welcome continued efforts to allow for maximum flexibility in the setting and periodic revisiting of priorities for ICANN in order to facilitate the effective participation of all stakeholder groups at any one time. In other words, the cumulative workload distributed across operational reviews, policy development processes and strategic decision-making at any one time must be reasonable.	Other suggestion	Several edits were made to acknowledge the need for reasonable workload and periodic re-assessment of priorities.	Yes	p. 13 & p. 26
58	7	ALAC	The ALAC agrees with the forecasted exponential growth of Internet end users, especially coming from Asia and Africa, and the number of Internet-connected devices that is growing at an even greater pace. So yes, ICANN must play a role in ensuring a single, stable, interoperable infrastructure, including delivering the IANA functions, to address the needs of all these (new) Internet end users and devices alike. Promoting and improving Universal Acceptance and the implementation of Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) as well as continuing to encourage readiness for IPv6, are therefore indeed necessary to reach a more diverse Internet end user base.	Support	Thank you for your comment.	No	
59	7	ALAC	With regard to the introduction of new gTLDs: whether that is necessary is another debate, but if new gTLDs are to be introduced then they should be "properly funded, managed and risk-evaluated" (objective/strategic goal 3.4). The diversity of gTLDs and the diversity of the business model should also factor into the considerations.	Other suggestion	Edited the goal to clarify the strategic intent	Yes	p. 17 & 21

...ent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
60	7	ALAC	Maintaining the credibility and global acceptability of the multistakeholder system must be an essential part of the Strategic Plan. We are conscious of the fact that Internet Governance is reaching a critical stage and the future will depend on how the current practical and political issues are addressed and resolved. Changes in data protection regulations in the E.U. have reverberations around the globe. The recent musings about multilateralism by French President Macron at the Paris IGF resulted in speculation about whether this was a challenge to the multistakeholder model. At-Large believes the multistakeholder process is worth fighting for, as it represents a governance model reflective of the original values around which the Internet was originally conceived – bottom-up and inclusive. The importance of the public interest in this process - and which is rightfully the responsibility of the entire ICANN community - cannot be overestimated.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
61	7	ALAC	The ALAC agrees that ICANN must replenish its Reserve Fund and that ICANN must continue to fund necessary investments to address essential technology and security requirements. Also, anything ICANN can practically do to strengthen 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 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 is unable 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 At-Large. Entry into the marketplace is not always positive. 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	The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired state ("the what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
62	7	ALAC	The ALAC agreed with the recent Board decision (albeit with some misgivings about the process) to put a portion of the auction proceeds towards replenishing the Reserve Fund. However, this action should be an exception or "one off" occurrence, and ICANN Org must continue to make other positive efforts to address maintaining an agreed level of Reserve Funds, such as adjustments where essential to expenditure and in budgeting and of course continuing to make regular contributions.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
63	7	ALAC	With respect to the issue of lack of alignment or consensus on priorities and goals among ICANN's stakeholders that result in conflicts about resource allocation, we suggest that, where such lack of alignment exists, it should be addressed and resolved in a process that engages the wider ICANN community. Finally, the ALAC/At-Large strongly believes that ICANN's strategic priorities and goals must drive 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.	No	
64	8	RySG	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. However, we believe that the plan requires more detail about how the 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 adoption 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-yr and annual operating and financial plans.	No	
65	8	RySG	Metrics and deliverables The relationship between the strategic goals, targeted outcomes, and strategic risks 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 assigned responsibilities, to allow for ICANN and the community to monitor progress and measure success throughout the five-year cycle.	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-yr and annual operating and financial plans. Progress is tracked through accountability indicators (https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators). The plan's introduction has been edited to make that apparent.	Yes	p. 3
66	8	RySG	Integration with the financial planning cycle We welcome 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, more detail is required about how ICANN plans to work and integrate the strategic planning cycle and the organisation'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 an initial costing 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 developing an operational and financial plan may lead to calibration of the strategic plan, in terms of affordability. The Board is thus considering a conditional adoption of the strategic plan, subject to adjustments as necessary.	No	
67	8	RySG	Future proof trends 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 developing the Strategic Plan. Trends, however, are to a certain extent unpredictable and may change in unexpected ways. Moreover, we note that the 'trends identification phase' took place in 2017-2018, that the Board is expected to adopt the Strategic Plan in June 2019, and that the Strategic Plan starts in July 2020. Trends may change between now and the start of the plan in 2020, or during the 2021-2025 cycle. It is important to have a clear and transparent process in place for adapting the Strategic Plan, if needed, as ICANN goes through the cycle. ICANN has a history of becoming caught up in the unpredictable: the IANA transition and GDPR being two recent examples of issues that were not foreseen and both resulted in considerable community and ICANN resources being devoted to these efforts. The draft Strategic Plan does not appear to have the flexibility to deal with such future scenarios. We strongly believe that in the event that the 'unforeseen' happens in the future ICANN must revisit the Strategic Plan and the associated budget to recalibrate in order to account for the 'unforeseen'. We also believe that when ICANN decides to take on projects that go beyond those specified in the Strategic Plan that they be required to explain to the community why they believe the project is important and how funds have been reallocated to the new project.	Other suggestion	ICANN's strategic planning process is described on ICANN.org here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/strategic-engagement-2013-10-10-en. The process indicates that "Every year, new trends or shifts in existing trends impacting the operating plans (five-year or annual), and/or budget, will be factored into the annual iteration of those plans as appropriate. Significant shifts could result in appropriate adjustments to the strategic plan, following the strategic planning process described above. Or, should trends be less significant but still relevant for appropriate adjustments to the 5-year operating plan, those adjustments will be made through the relevant process." In addition, the section on Financials includes a strategic goal on ICANN's planning. That goal (now 5.1) and underlying outcomes have been edited, taking this input in consideration.	Yes	p. 26
68	8	RySG	Tracking the Strategic Plan over its lifetime The RySG believes that the best way to achieve solid metrics, reliable financials, and future-proofed projects is to clearly link all work back to the Strategic Plan. When ICANN initiates new projects meant to achieve the strategic goals outlined in the Strategic Plan, it should make very clear to the ICANN community how those projects connect to the Plan and how they support ICANN's strategic objectives, why the particular objectives and projects were selected over others, and why ICANN is the proper owner for the project. This added level of communication, coupled with regular and consistent report of the progress made against the Strategic Plan, will enhance the community's ability to assess the success of the Plan and make us more effective at helping to inform future Strategic Plans.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment, which will be taken in consideration for the development of the FY21-25 Operating & Financial Plan.	No	
69	9	RrSG	The RrSG welcomes ICANN restating that it shall not act outside of its mission (b) and shall be held accountable to its mission statement. Additionally, as is stated in (c), it's important to have reiterated that ICANN is not a regulator.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
70	9	RrSG	Whilst the RrSG welcomes this focus, we would be interested to know how ICANN intends on engaging with the registrars and DNS stakeholders to understand and mitigate the mentioned security threats. Engagement on key issues so far has been minimal and focused instead on a small amount of the participating community. How does ICANN intend on reaching the wider community? Another challenge for ICANN is how to create space within its rigid community structure for new participants. If this doesn't happen, the work risks being an empty mantra (like the current 'security and stability of the DNS'), or being tucked into SSAC or the staff OCTO team, and now 'owned' by the ICANN community. The RrSG would welcome the opportunity to further help with registrar outreach and education in the stakeholder group forum on this matter.	Other suggestion	The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired state ("the "what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
71	9	RrSG	Volunteer and participation fatigue is a long standing issue within the ICANN community that is not likely to be resolved any time soon and particularly impacts policy development. How does ICANN intend to accelerate policy development when there is a recognised burn-out of participants?	Other suggestion	Conciliating seemingly competing goals is the main challenge of this objective on ICANN's governance. The narratives under objective #2 have been edited to make that more apparent.	Yes	p. 13
72	9	RrSG	The "closed model" adopted by the EPDP may achieve better speed and efficiency, but it may sacrifice diversity or inclusivity. How does ICANN intend to achieve the seemingly competing goals of increasing diversity and capacity across all parts of its ecosystem and ensuring that work gets done and policies are developed in an effective and timely manner?	Other suggestion	Conciliating seemingly competing goals is the main challenge of this objective on ICANN's governance. The introduction has been edited to make that more apparent. The "how" will have to be developed in concertation with the community in the operating plan.	No	
73	9	RrSG	Furthermore, the RrSG has seen and is concerned by the use of policy development as a means to push for a singular view or outcome, regardless of the degree to which it is relevant to the policy's central mission. Progress depends upon those participating in policy development being prepared to work towards compromise and mutual gain and the bottom-up multi-stakeholder model does not operate well when time is continually wasted, or discussion halted, by polarized positions that do not represent the collective interest. The RrSG would like to see ICANN actively working towards minimising this kind of behaviour and looks forward to the work by GNSO Council on PDP 3.0 in the hope that improved processes will do the same.	Other suggestion	These concerns are acknowledged in the second strategic risk under goal 3.2. The risk has been edited for better clarity.	Yes	p.15
74	9	RrSG	The RrSG would like to see ICANN looking 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: - ICANN's actually coming quite late to the party. Other organisations 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. - Should this come about, it could potentially be a new source of revenue for the ICANN community (arising out of IoT unique identifiers in addition to domains). So, this could help to future proof ICANN's financial sources of income. The RrSG also believes that allocation of funds to this work would be an appropriate use of auction proceeds.	Other suggestion	The Objective on Unique Identifiers System and associated strategic goals have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.	No	
75	9	RrSG	Recent changes appear to have blindsided ICANN, with a number of key decisions needing to be made hurriedly and without proper time for community discussion and consideration (the Temporary Specification being the most obvious example), so the RrSG welcomes a more proactive approach. The community can certainly be used as an early warning system, but ICANN must be prepared to listen rather than react when it is essentially too late.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
76	9	RrSG	The RrSG would like to echo our comments submitted on the FY20 budget. ICANN is surrounded by business experts who must get their financial planning right, especially when reporting growth expectations to the market. Conversely, ICANN budgeting exercises appear to be carried out in isolation, without community input on their own forecasts until decisions are essentially already made. A balance between income growth and realistic expenditure must be sought and the community must do more to limit reliance on ICANN's cash.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
77	10	GNSO Council	**Introduction** 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 org and the ICANN community toward more awareness, coordination, accountability, transparency, and representative engagement. We are broadly comfortable with the five trends that have been identified, however we offer more specific comments in the text that follows. **Conclusion** We appreciate the opportunity to submit the GNSO Council's perspectives on the draft Strategic Plan. The GNSO Council appreciates the clarity and focus of calling for specific planning, prioritizing, and preserving of actions. As the GNSO is a part of the Empowered Community we look forward to reviewing all inputs from the public comment process which addresses ICANN's broader strategy and budget. Finally, the GNSO Council would be happy to answer any clarifying questions that you may have regarding the contents of this document.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
78	10	GNSO Council	- *Evolve ICANN's governance model to remain effective, transparent, and accountable;* If evolution and improvements to ICANN governance model are necessary, the GNSO Council suggest amending this statement to read "Evolve ICANN's governance model to be increasingly effective, transparent, and accountable".	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 4
79	10	GNSO Council	- *Improve the effectiveness of ICANN's policy development processes;* The GNSO Council is concerned that there is a danger in privileging 'effectiveness' in the Policy Development Process without concurrently considering inclusivity. We therefore ask that this sentence be revised to read, "Improve the effectiveness of ICANN's **multistakeholder** policy development processes".	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 4
80	10	GNSO Council	- *Anticipate and manage the impact of legislation and regulation; and* The GNSO Council supports the continued examination of legislation and regulations to foster a fuller understanding of ICANN's roles and responsibilities and the potential impact on gTLD policies and GNSO policy development. If ICANN continues to have difficulties in recognizing, understanding, and balancing its evolving legal obligations in relation to activities within its remit (as was for the case, for instance, with the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation), this could pose a risk to the organization's legitimacy, sustainability, and reputation.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
81	10	GNSO Council	- *Ensure ICANN is technically robust and financially sustainable.* This statement is acceptable. The GNSO Council would like to see a downward trend in ICANN's operating costs without there being any undue impacts on policy development activities, which are and must remain a core ICANN activity.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
82	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council supports this objective and have taken our own steps in 2018 and early 2019 to develop "PDP 3.0 Recommendations" for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Council in managing the GNSO Policy Development Processes.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
83	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
84	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council recommends adding clarifying language that Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees "make timely and effective decisions that are in the global public interest and consistent with ICANN's mission and bylaws."	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit.	Yes	p. 15
85	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks. However, it is important that such goals include the importance of "informed" policy making. This could be strengthened by a small change, "... and active, **informed**, effective participation."	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit.	Yes	p. 13 & 15

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
86	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council requests clarification regarding the intended implementation of this outcome. Without further clarification, we suggest that "new technologies" be revised to read, "new technologies which directly impact the reliability, stability, and security of the Domain Name System" so to ensure ICANN stays on mission.	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit #86 & 132. Also addresses comment #8.	Yes	p. 17 & p. 19
87	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council acknowledges the Targeted Outcomes and Risks, but can only accept this outcome subject to the satisfactory completion of relevant policy development work first being undertaken. Accordingly, we request that this objective be reworded so as not to pre-suppose any outcome: "Subject to completion, GNSO Council approval and ICANN Board approval of a Final Report of the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, ICANN will plan a properly funded, managed and implemented expansion of gTLDs."	Support, with edits	Edited the goal to clarify the strategic intent	Yes	p. 17 & 21
88	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council supports this objective, particularly if/when such geopolitical issues may impact GNSO Policy Development Processes and Implementation Review Teams.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
89	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks, particularly if/when such early warning systems can inform the ongoing or future work of GNSO Policy Development and Implementation processes.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
90	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks. We recognize the value of a deep and informed pool of volunteers that will contribute to GNSO policy development activities.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
91	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council supports this objective and recognizes both the cost and value of ICANN's support for GNSO policy development and implementation activities.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
92	10	GNSO Council	While market trends should be considered in organizational guidance, it should be noted that market trends are only relevant insofar as they 1) overlap with the current mission of ICANN, 2) as they affect ICANN's stability and resilience, 3) impact ongoing or future Policy Development and Implementation activities, and 4) impact ICANN's stream of revenue.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
93	10	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council agrees with the Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
94	11	Business Constituency	Overall, the BC agrees with the content of the Plan	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
95	11	Business Constituency	The BC notes that ICANN is proposing to amend its Vision statement in this next Strategic Plan, therefore it makes sense to acknowledge this somewhere in the Introductory language.	Support, with edits	The introduction section of the strategic plan already acknowledges " a renewed vision statement". No changes necessary.	No	
96	11	Business Constituency	On the 6th paragraph and last sentence, BC recommends that a link reference for the mentioned bylaws be provided.	Support, with edits	Added link to the mentioned bylaws.	Yes	p. 3
97	11	Business Constituency	Question: What constitutes the global public interest? BC thinks this phrase needs to be defined before it is used. As noted most recently in our Jun-2013 comment to Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT-2), 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 ensure the availability and integrity of registration and resolution services. But it is not for the BC or the ATRT to define public interest for ICANN. The definition should be derived through a process that is open to the ICANN community and Internet stakeholders – including 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.	Other suggestion	ICANN's role to serve the global public interest is a key aspect of all work done and decisions made. The definition of what is in the public interest is situational. For the purposes of the strategic plan, ICANN has provided more specific language where appropriate.	Yes	p. 3 & p. 14
98	11	Business Constituency	The BC notes the Mission of ICANN has not been changed, and supports this decision.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
99	11	Business Constituency	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.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
100	11	Business Constituency	To the extent there is implicit priority in how ICANN lists these Strategic Objectives, it stands to reason that #3 should be first because that is in itself ICANN's main remit.	Other suggestion	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.	Yes	p. 7
101	11	Business Constituency	However, Strategic Goal 3.4 concerning new gTLDs seems tactical and not strategic, and not consistent with the level of import of other points in this section, particularly in light of the weakness of initial new gTLD impacts.	Concern	Edited the goal to clarify the strategic intent	Yes	p. 17 & 21
102	11	Business Constituency	We agree 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.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
103	11	Business Constituency	Improving the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model is clearly a priority. ICANN is rightfully developing a reputation for being slow, combative, and less transparent. Decisions and process in the EPDP are just the latest examples in this regard.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
104	11	Business Constituency	As to geopolitical issues, ICANN appears at risk of being marginalized by governments and organizations that wish to increase their influence over internet policy, as evidenced by policies originating out of the EU, China, and Russia. If ICANN truly wants to be a 'Champion' of the open internet it surely needs to retain or regain its footing on the global stage.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
105	11	Business Constituency	Notwithstanding the opening paragraph in this section, stating a Strategic Objective of financial sustainability incurs moral hazard. One can achieve financial stability by increasing revenue or operating more efficiently. But only the latter involves the true discipline ICANN needs, based on observing spending trends over the 5 years of the prior (current) Strategic Plan. This Objective should be re-worded to reflect only Goal 5.2, and possibly 5.3. To this extent, the BC welcomes the 'Operating Plan' which the document states is forthcoming.	Concern	Goals under objective on Financials have been edited to clarify the strategic intent.	Yes	p. 25 to 29
106	12	GAC	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 - https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann61-agenda-item-30-strategic-outlook-community-session and https://mm.icann.org/mailman/private/gac/attachments/20180417/10a39b0a/GACTrendsSession13March2018Outputs-0001.pdf).	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
107	12	GAC	That input [the specific opportunity afforded to GAC members and observers to contribute to the development phase of the initial draft strategic plan] is appropriate because active government participation in ICANN activities is a principle firmly rooted in the ICANN Bylaws. That role should be clearly acknowledged in the new Strategic Plan for 2021-2025.* * footnote: The Bylaws clearly state that ICANN itself "does not hold any governmentally authorized regulatory authority" (see, ICANN Bylaws Section 1.1(c)). The ICANN Bylaws commit the organization to "employ open, transparent and bottom-up multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector "… while duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities" (see ICANN Bylaws section 1.2(a)(iv). Moreover, ICANN's core values obligate the organization to "… recogniz[e] that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly tak[e] into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities." (see ICANN Bylaws section 1.2 (b)(vi)).	Other suggestion	A reference to ICANN's commitments and cove values was added to the narratives of section #2 on ICANN's governance. It is important to note that while the strategic plan supports the Bylaws, and cannot be read to alter these.	Yes	p. 13
108	12	GAC	The GAC acknowledges the framework of the proposed strategic plan that outlines five 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 this second of the five strategic objectives.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
109	12	GAC	The GAC agrees that to achieve this second objective, three primary strategic goals should include: 2.1. 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; 2.2. Strengthen ICANN's multistakeholder decision-making process; and 2.3. Strengthen the inclusivity and openness of ICANN's multistakeholder model by improving and sustaining diverse representation and active, effective participation.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
110	12	GAC	The GAC believes that the second strategic goal would be bolstered by specifically mentioning the contribution of policy advice in the multistakeholder decision making process. Thus, in the list of "targeted outcomes for strategic goal 2.2, 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 new text in **bold red font**)	Support, with edits	A reference to policy advice was added to the outcomes under goal 2.1.	Yes	p. 15
111	12	GAC	The GAC welcomes the draft plan's emphasis in strategic goal 2.3 to improve and sustain "diverse representation and active, effective participation". The GAC is working to achieve improved participation and engagement among contributors to its own committee work. That philosophy was also integral 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, "Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN", issued at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017, the two advisory committees urged the Board to incorporate new document management and briefing capabilities to enable non-expert stakeholders to meaningfully participate in ICANN's processes and make their voices, their needs and interests heard (see, e.g., https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann60-abu-dhabi-communique). In its reply, the Board referred to the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI), launched in January 2018, which will, hopefully, lead to the creation of a document managing system that – as required by the ALAC and the GAC – will allow, even to non-expert stakeholders, a quick and easy access to ICANN documents. **It is important that completion and delivery of the ITI be a featured part of the strategic plan implementation – perhaps deserving its own specific reference as one of the outcomes of this strategic goal 2.3 or elsewhere in the strategic plan.** More recently, as a follow-up to that initial joint statement, the two committees further clarified the need for improved executive summary materials, stating "clear and up-to-date information to facilitate quick understanding of relevant issues and high interest topics is key for inclusive, informed and meaningful participation by all stakeholders, including non-experts. (see, https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann63-barcelona-communique).	Other suggestion	The strategic plan focuses on describing a desired state ("the what"). The description of tactical activities to accomplish (the "how") to fulfill the strategic objectives and goals will be developed in the operating plan.	No	
112	13	NCSG	**Introduction to the Plan** Increased Internet use, greater regulatory activity, the IANA transitions and many other internal and external factors underscore the importance ICANN's next strategic plan in the form of a renewed vision statement, as well as new strategic objectives, goals, targeted outcomes, and risks. We echo the need for this plan to guide ICANN toward greater global representation, transparency, and accountability. The five primary trends synthesized from stakeholder input are largely acceptable to the NCSG. However, we request the board to revisit some of the details we note below.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
113	13	NCSG	**Vision** We agree that updating the vision statement (in italics below) post IANA transition is necessary, but we do request changes in some instances. *To be a champion of the single, open, and globally interoperable Internet, by being the independent, trusted, multistakeholder steward of the Internet's unique identifiers, and by providing an open and collaborative environment where diverse stakeholders come together in the global public interest to:* ● This introductory statement to the vision is acceptable.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
114	13	NCSG	*- Secure operational excellence of the IANA functions;* ● We would prefer the term 'ensure', since to secure may be misconstrued to privilege the security concerns while 'ensure' more accurately reflects the desire to 'guarantee' excellence. We suggest that 'in the stewardship' be inserted into the sentence to clarify its scope. We therefore suggest that the vision be revised to read, " Ensure operational excellence in the stewardship of the IANA functions."	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 4
115	13	NCSG	*- Continuously improve the unique identifier systems;* ● This statement is acceptable.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
116	13	NCSG	*- Strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS Root Server System;* ● This statement is acceptable.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
117	13	NCSG	*- Evolve ICANN's governance model to remain effective, transparent, and accountable;* ● This statement calls for action to remain the same. It implies that ICANN is 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".	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 4
118	13	NCSG	*- Improve the effectiveness of ICANN's policy development processes;* ● There is a danger in privileging 'effectiveness' in the Policy Development Process without concurrently considering inclusivity. We would therefore prefer "Improve the effectiveness **and inclusiveness** of ICANN's **multistakeholder** policy development processes".	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 4
119	13	NCSG	*- Anticipate and manage the impact of legislation and regulation; and* ● This statement is acceptable. We consider ICANN's headstrong refusal for over 20 years to adhere to its legal obligations vis-à-vis privacy law to have been an institutional failure. Should this continue, this could pose a significant threat to the organization's legitimacy, sustainability, and reputation.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
120	13	NCSG	*- Ensure ICANN is technically robust and financially sustainable.* ● This statement is acceptable.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
121	13	NCSG	Mission ● No changes are proposed and thus no comments are pertinent here.	Support	Thank you for your comment.	No	
122	13	NCSG	We question the value of only mentioning one security issue (DDOS attacks linked to IoT devices on pg. 8) in the opening summary. This paragraph is not necessary in the introduction.	Other suggestion	Edited the 2nd paragraph of the narratives under the section #1 on Security.	Yes	p. 8
123	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
124	13	NCSG	Agree with Outcomes and Risks. Specifically we commend the goal of developing a coordinated emergency plan.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
125	13	NCSG	We think the first outcome listed should be updated as follows replace the word 'Internet' with 'DNS and unique identifiers system': "The inherent security of the DNS and unique identifiers system measurably increases, due to higher adoption of global open Internet standards and greater awareness of security threats among stakeholders."	Support, with edits	Accepted the suggested edit.	Yes	p. 11
126	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
127	13	NCSG	Acceptable summary	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
128	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
129	13	NCSG	Remove "global public interest" and replace with "reliability, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure".	Support, with edits	ICANN's role to serve the global public interest is a key aspect of all work done 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.	Yes	p. 3 & p. 14
130	13	NCSG	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, "… active, **informed** , effective participation."	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit.	Yes	p. 13 & 15
131	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
132	13	NCSG	Update to read "new technologies which directly impact the reliability, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure" to ensure ICANN stays on mission.	Support, with edits	Accepted suggested edit #86 & 132. Also addresses comment #8.	Yes	p. 17 & p. 19
133	13	NCSG	ICANN does not deliver the IANA functions since the incorporation of PTI in 2016. Section 3.3 should be removed as its appropriate location is within PTI's documentation set and remit.	Concern	ICANN's Bylaws obligate it to establish an entity for the performance of the IANA functions, and for ICANN to serve as the sole member of that entity. In addition, ICANN's Bylaws also obligate it to have a contract 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 both in ICANN's Strategic Plan as well as providing operational details on that work in the affiliate's documentation.	No	

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
134	13	NCSG	The NCSG would welcome the opportunity to evaluate a new round of gTLDs. We ask that this sentence be revised so to read: " Evaluate a properly funded, managed, and risk-evaluated expansion of gTLDs."	Support, with edits	Edited the goal to clarify the strategic intent	Yes	p. 17 & 21
135	13	NCSG	Acceptable summary	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
136	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
137	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
138	13	NCSG	While market trends should be considered in organizational guidance, it should be noted that market trends are only relevant insofar as they overlap with the current mission of ICANN.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
139	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks. These should not impact the community first, and efforts should be shared by all, including ICANN staff and the Board.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
140	13	NCSG	Agree with Targeted Outcomes and Risks.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
141	13	NCSG	**Conclusion** Some targeted outcomes are vague while others are very specific. We laud the clarity and focus of calling for specific planning, prioritizing, preserving actions. We feel that there should be an increased emphasis on the notion that a primary targeted outcome is to ensure that ICANN stays within its current mission statement and bylaws. Emerging technologies and greater interests from increased actors threaten to pull ICANN's attention and resources toward areas that do not directly pertain to the reliability, stability, and security of the DNS and Internet infrastructure. Staying aware of market trends may help ICANN stay financially solvent but should not become an undue distraction from clearly defined mission of ICANN.	Support, with edits	Edited the 1st paragraph of the introduction, specifying that ICANN acts within the scope of its mission.	Yes	p. 3
142	14	Mark Svancarek (	Macron's speech at IGF was an indicator of French/Germany/Swiss intent to pursue more multilateral internet governance, I think, and during our BASIS F2F with German delegation at IGF they confirmed our interpretation. So perhaps not EU, per se.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
143	15	At-Large Advisory	Ratified: ICANN Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2021 – 2025 Please find attached the ALAC statement regarding ICANN Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2021 – 2025. Content of the statement remains unchanged. Ratification information is included on the cover page. On 15 February 2019, staff confirmed that the online vote results in the ALAC endorsing the statement with 13 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions. Please note 93% (14) of the 15 ALAC Members participated in the poll. The ALAC Members who participated in the poll are (alphabetical order by first name): Bartlett Morgan, Bastiaan Goslings, Hadia Elminiawi, Humberto Carrasco, Holly Raiche, Javier Rua-Jovet, John Laprise, Kaili Kan, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Holmquist, Sebastien Bachollet, Seun Ojedeji and Tijani Ben Jemaa. One ALAC Member, Joanna Kulesza, did not participate. You may view the result independently under: https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=1336578pnjV9UqTJg4FtP8pHJGU.	Support	Noting the ratification of ALAC's statement, with no changes.	No	
144	PS-1	Julie Hammer	the additional topics that have been mentioned, I don't see a problem with any of those things, but I – my view is that they come in at the next level down in the strategic plan, where ICANN is talking about implementing –mechanisms for implementing the strategic goals. So my view is that they're all good comments, but they shouldn't necessarily reflect in the strategic goals, but perhaps at the next level down.	Other suggestion	Thank you for your comment.	No	
145	PS-2	Wolf-Ulrich Knobe	Looking for the timeline of these strategic goals, when you are covering a time span of five years from 2020 to '25, I think one of the biggest issues here under these goals is the structural issue maybe so in some parts of the communities. And as you know, this is related to the years of reviews we are undergoing with regards to the different parts of the community. And these reviews take even longer than your time span is with regards to the strategic goals. So what I would say is – so you have to take into consideration whether an improvement of these org processes could be done in relation to that time span so in order to cope with that. We had a discussion already here in our community with regards to some items of the structural reviews, and we are happy to come up with in the Thursday and in other meetings as well. I think there is a lot of improvement to be done, and I would like to know from the Board whether you take into consideration these type of goals and time span when you are going to rephrase these goals.	Support, with edits	We agree that efforts to improve Organizational and Specific reviews will contribute to this objective, and have made that more apparent in the outcomes under goal 2.1.	Yes	p. 14
146	PS-3	Alan Greenberg	All of the goals that you've outlined are going to be real challenges in their own way. This one, however, I think really tops – is it top of the cake? Not because it is implicitly more difficult but because it involves the cooperation of a far wider number of people with very different interests. And we have active things going on today that address some of those conflicts. You know, it is more efficient to have fewer people but it's not as inclusive. And we have strong actions on both increasing inclusivity in some areas and in other areas. Let's restrict the number of people who can do this. We have pretty well determined that face-to-face meetings are crucial for some types of decisions and some types of actions, but we have strong financial concerns and constraints on them. So not only is it difficult but we have actions that are ongoing today that are working in opposite directions. So this is perhaps the one that from an ICANN operational point of view is most crucial and is probably going to most difficult. So good luck.	Support	The goals under section #2 on ICANN's governance, and the associated targeted outcomes and risks have been edited to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.	Yes	p. 13 to 16
147	PS-4	Elsa Saade	I think all of us are aware of the developments of the PDP 3.0. And I think there are a lot of overlaps with some of those efforts that are related to Number 2, improving the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance, in a way. And I'm just wondering if there might be some kind of collaboration in a way whereby the PDP 3.0 developments would affect this strategic plan going forward and vice versa.	Other suggestion	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.	Yes	p.14
148	PS-4	Elsa Saade	And the second point I wanted to make was related to the Board working group on anti-harassment, which is very much related to the inclusiveness, being inclusive of women in this space. And I just wanted to acknowledge the fact that the Board has been working on this effort and I'm very thankful for it. And I hope this could also be included in this point particularly so that more women in the space would be present and their participation wouldn't be hindered by any kind of harassment or assault in this space. So thank you.	Other suggestion	The goals under section #2 on ICANN's governance, and the associated targeted outcomes and risks have been edited to clarify the strategic intent behind each goal.	Yes	p. 13 to 16
149	PS-5	Kavouss Arasteh	Efficiency is not versus inclusivity. They are complement to each other. You could increase efficiency and maintain or improve the inclusivity. There are not process. Similarly, efficiency, you can increase efficiency in the bottom-up process which we do but they are not versus. Having said that, at the beginning of the text it say, cooperation and compromise. Are we compromising within these things? I don't think we compromise with that. Perhaps we need to do some other term to do that one.	Other suggestion	This comment is in reference to a bullet point on the slide presented at the public session at ICANN64 in Kobe, not on actual text of the strategic plan itself. No changes necessary.	No	
150	PS-5	Kavouss Arasteh	The second bullet, the sentence is – something is missing. Need to – sorry, need for adequate resources to do the work community group. To do the work community group, and then are charged. Something is missing within these several words. So there need to be a sort of amendment to clear what we really mean by this second bullet. Currently it is very awkward English and need to be corrected.	Other suggestion	This comment is in reference to a bullet point on the slide presented at the public session in Kobe, not on actual text of the strategic plan itself. No changes necessary.	No	
151	PS-5	Kavouss Arasteh	With respect to previous slide you have used two words. One word you said to "educate." We have told in many ICANN meetings that we should not use the word "education." We should use the word "increase awareness" but not "educate." We don't educate each other. We increase awareness of each other. And second, is "to understand." It might be better to use the word "to acknowledge" instead of "to understand." To acknowledge, then we're acknowledging the cybersecurity threats and mitigate that. But not to understand that. So these are the things that need to be corrected and amended in order the text to be readable and to be understandable by the people.	Other suggestion	A full scan of the document was made to review the various occurrences where the words "understand" and "educate" were used. Several edits were made, where an alternative verb appeared to be a better word choice, in light of this comment.	Yes	p. 8 & 11 p. 17 & 19 p. 24

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
152	PS-6	Wolf-Ulrich Knobe	It's a positive comment. A very positive one. So I congratulate that you put the encouragement for IDN implementation, universal acceptance of IANAs and so -- on top of that. So really nothing to say. We are in full support with that. We are cooperating with that. That's one of our major, major goals internally as well, to bring that to a positive result. And I would really encourage you to follow with that as well. And in addition, we also are very interested in trying also to bring in people who are interested in the -- in the new identifier systems in the IoT environment. And so we heard from Goran that he's also open as well to -- to cooperation with his COO -- not the COO, the tech, CTO department in that respect. So I think it's on a good way and I would like to encourage sometimes to come back to that and help us and encourage us to continue. Thank you.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
153	PS-7	John Curran	The NRO, the Number Resource Organization, submitted a comment on behalf of the five RIRs regarding these strategic goals, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, asking that, to the extent that those goals are with respect to Internet number resources that work on them be coordinated with the RIRs. We ask that this comment be well considered in future edits of this draft plan. Thank you.	Support, with edits	The objective on Unique Identifiers System has been edited to acknowledge that other parties will play a part in achieving the goals under this objective.	Yes	p. 17
154	PS-8	Donna Austin	In relation to support the adoption of IDNs, it's a really challenging topic so prior to being with Neustar I was with AusRegistry, and they had .SHABAKA which was one of the first IDN TLDs that went into the root. There were many challenges because there wasn't the infrastructure or the support for the TLD from registrars, so what we were looking for was an end-to-end experience for the registrant so that they could register the name with -- in Arabic, so the full experience was to be Arabic. One of the other realizations is that there's not a market for the -- for the IDN TLD and it's difficult to create that market. So it's -- so I'm not really sure when you're looking for community input to support the adoption of IDNs, you know, how broad that is or what you're actually looking for in that regard. But I would also add that, you know, putting IDNs to one side, one of the challenges for many of the new registry operators -- and this is something we tried to engage GDD 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 was global. So a lot of registry operators put a lot of effort and resources into marketing their own TLDs, but in terms of a consumer awareness campaign, to explain to the global Internet community that there are these new extensions and they are available and they are safe and people can actually use them and they provide competition in the marketplace, that's something from a registry -- certainly the registry stakeholder perspective that's been absent. 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 consumer awareness campaign about one of the biggest expansions of the Internet that we've seen in many years. So -- and I see that that is directly related to the support and adoption of IDNs. Thanks.	Other 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 edited to acknowledge the collective efforts needed to support this goal.	Yes	p.18
155	PS-9	Vivek Goyal	Just looking at bullet point 3.4, and it may be the wordings that it says but from all those people who are waiting for the new round of gTLDs to open, I think it should not be plan a properly funded round but execute. And in terms of round, it should say new rounds. It should not appear that we are only planning one round in the next five years. Thank you.	Support, with edits	Edited the goal to clarify the strategic intent	Yes	p. 17 & 21
156	PS-10	Kavouss Arasteh	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 ITU. There was a term "migration" to IPv6. Then there was term "transition." But finally in plenipotentiary 2018 in Dubai the word "deployment" also was used. That's good. However, you need a close collaboration with other organization involved in order to assist the countries they want to deploy the IPv6. From technical point of view, from support point of view, how you could do that, there has been a lot of requests but unfortunately up to now there has not been any tangible reply to that. So they need to have some sort of sub regional arrangement for the countries having the same problems, same difficulty for transition or for deployment IPv6 to see what are the problems and how you could help them. Apart from that, some countries, I don't want to mention, I don't want to go into details, they have technical obstacle for deployment IPv6 from the viewpoint of the import of the equipment and other materials. I think there should be some way to assist these countries that they wish and they're eager to have IPv6 but this obstacle does not allow them to do that. That is very important issue. And I think this is one of the very, very important elements that ICANN needs to embark on. Thank you.	Other suggestion	The ICANN strategic plan is a global document, not going into regional specificities. We encourage you to follow the development of ICANN's regional strategic plans. No changes made here. At a regional level, ICANN does work with RIRs and regional TLD organizations with capacity development on DNS technical issues. IPv6 is one of the areas of collaboration at a regional level.	No	
157	PS-11	Name not transcr	I have a comment for -- to the IDN-related issues. So to IDN standard is a standard -- was standard in 2003. Email Address Internationalization standard was in 2012. So after many, many years it's -- Internet community still feel adoption of IDN and the EAI is very, very low. So first, we thank ICANN to support IDN in next five years. So that's me -- thank you very much. So I also thank the USG to allow the work to USG as a bigger platform, attract many (indiscernible) email service providers, (indiscernible) companies to involve in this platform to adopt the IDN and the EAI standards. Currently Microsoft and Gmail and many local email companies and also many open source already support EAI IDN. But Internet user feels that -- so deployment really is still very low. But very few companies, Internet users, feel companies really use internationalized email address and IDN names. Also, IDN name have been register I think more than millions of domain names. But the answer resolution is very, very low. So I think maybe next five years ICANN -- ICANN Internet community have -- find a better solution to make IDN adoption and EAI adoption is better. So one thing I think ICANN can do is first ICANN can make their IT systems to -- information systems to support IDN and EAI. For example, I'm a registry or registrar or registrant. I send internationalized email address to ICANN. Can ICANN accept this email address or not? So in the ICANN some Web page there are no list of international email address or list international domain names. So in future, if I want to communicate to ICANN president, ICANN CEO, maybe better, list some Chinese email address or India email address, Russia email address, Sweden or German email address, French email address so that we can easily communicate with ICANN Board, ICANN directors. So last time we have our meeting, USG meeting in Guang Zhou, the India person said IDN EAI will try to make a nice 2 billion on Internet users to use Internet. Thank you very much.	Other suggestion	ICANN IT's current roadmap sees ICANN email systems becoming EAI-ready in roughly the Jan-Mar 2020 timeframe. EAI-readiness will be achieved in 6 discrete steps. Each will result in ICANN's email system becoming EAI-ready. Results will only be visible when the 6th and final step is taken. The other steps are required as precursors to system-wide EAI-readiness.	No	
158	PS-12	Lori Schulman	I'm looking at the word "threats." So is GDPR a need or a threat? I think the word "threats" may be a bit threatening and I'm wondering if it's better to say "needs and trends." There's a global trend towards privacy, and I don't think classifying it as a threat is a good idea for a lot of reasons. So I would suggest changing that word "threats" to "trends."	Support, with edits	The word 'threats' has been replaced with 'challenges and opportunities'.	Yes	p. 22 & 23
159	PS-13	Barrack Otieno	With regard to relationships with the regional organization, first of all, I want to appreciate the work that has been happening between the global stakeholder engagement team and the regional organizations. I'm saying that having worked with the team from Africa for the last five years. And we have seen some considerable growth on the ground as a result of that. But, again, we need to continue strengthening that. I see that happening in other regions, specifically, with the DNS forum events that I have been involved with in one way or the other. So I will just encourage that more support from the ICANN organization, especially to the regional partnerships, to be extended.

The second thing is, with regard to collaboration with country code top-level domain registries, we need more collaboration, especially in the light of best practices. We are having unique challenges in our region. And I'm speaking from the Africa region, where we see increased interest from regulators in country code top-level domain registries. And it's bringing confusion. I think it's good for the role of regulators to be highlighted. And we need help from ICANN, ISOC, be it at ITU level or from whichever sources to just highlight what is the best practice. Because sometimes when the referee becomes a player, then it becomes a problem in the field. There's always a problem. And we are seeing slowly a direction in which there will be a bit of confusion if the role of regulators is not clarified, the role of ccTLDs is not clarified, and issues of best practice are not clarified. So I hope this can really be part and parcel of this strategic planning exercise that we are setting in place. | Other suggestion | Acknowledging the need for collaboration with ccTLDs, the 1st outcome under 4.2 has been edited to include local partners (not just regional and global). | Yes | p.24 |
| 160 | PS-14 | Kavouss Arasteh | I don't think we have any multistakeholder system. We have multistakeholder approach or we have multistakeholder model. We don't have system. There is no system of multistakeholder, because system has specific connotations. What we've used up to now is approach or model. That is number one. | Other suggestion | This is in reference to a bullet point on the slide presented at the session, not on actual text of the strategic plan itself. No changes necessary. | No | |

nent #	Submission #	Commenter Name	Comment	Comment Category	Response	Change	Where
161	PS-14	Kavouss Arasteh	The point two is in the subbullet collaboration with country code registries. I think you have already collaboration. Perhaps one could say continued collaboration or foster collaboration. If you say collaboration, that means up to now there is no collaboration and you start from scratch. But you have 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	The 1st outcome under goal 4.2 has been edited according to your suggestion.	Yes	p. 24
162	PS-15	Vivek Goyal	How are we going to measure ICANN's success on these strategic goals year on year or quarter on quarter to see if we are doing well, good, not so good, and making changes in our operations to know that we are doing better and better quarter on quarter, year on year? Because without a way to measure these, how do we tell to the community that, yes, we have done what we set out to do?	Other suggestion	Progress is tracked through accountability indicators (https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators). The plan's introduction has been edited to make that apparent.	Yes	p. 3
163	PS-16	Roelof Meijer	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've been in this committee 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. We're really doing well in that area.	Support	Thank you for your comment.	No	
164	PS-16	Roelof Meijer	My other comment - If you look at your strategic objectives and your strategic goals, most of them are specified by a verb, which to me indicates 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 state an action and not an end point? So that will be my suggestion. Go through the goals again and see if you could better change some of the wording from an action into a goal, a real goal, so that we know when we've been successful. There's a lot of improve, encourage, understand, plan, evolve without stating the end point.	Other suggestion	Several of the goals were rephrased 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 Perrin	I would like to echo the previous speakers' comments. Thank you thank you very much for the increased detail that we're getting in the budgets. I'd like to encourage you to break them down into smaller pieces yet. I think it will help us measure our productivity, and against the KPIs. And I totally agree also that outcomes are really important. [...] I think we really need to develop KPIs and better metrics for measuring our own contributions to ICANN and how well it's working. I mean, this is fundamental to supporting the multistakeholder model. Why do you have us hanging around? It's not just to annoy the business community, you know, or to introduce threats like GDPR. So I'm struggling with that, to develop those KPIs and metrics, and we'd love some help. I'm going to be pestering the finance folks. But I think that across the board we need improvement in our metrics. It's not just us. But we'd certainly like to get your help on that.	Other suggestion	Progress is tracked through accountability indicators (https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators). The plan's introduction has been edited to make that apparent.	Yes	p. 3
166	PS-18	Marilyn Cade	I'm going to open my comments by remembering an experience that perhaps Theresa will also remember, I'm not sure any of the rest of you will, but when ICANN introduced its first strategic plan, it made it all the way to version 19 with no community input at all. And the GNSO -- Bruce Tonkin was the chair of the GNSO at the time, and we collected $5,000 and funded a stakeholder-wide review two-day session in Amsterdam, and members of the community, some of whom are here, came and you have to remember there were very few staff at the time. And that was the first real engagement of the community. So look how far we've come. That's my message. And look how seriously we're taking it. But I think we have to be very clear that with the kinds of changes that, Cherine, you as board chair were referencing this morning overall for our future, there are really significant challenges for this community -- these communities, as busy as they are, to be able to properly digest and be able to provide informed information beyond those of us who work continually horizontally on these issues. So thank you for this session, and thank you for everything that you have been doing to try to reach at the constituency level and the SG level.	Support	Thank you for your support.	No	
167	PS-18	Marilyn Cade	Now here's my question. I heard something that alarmed me, and I think -- and that's why I'm asking. I think that it was not an intentional statement of intent, so I'm going to ask. There was a kind of casual 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 printing 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 fall overdue to poor business plans, et cetera. So I'm only speaking for myself on this, but I do know many in the global business community who are very concerned that ICANN's business model not become about delivering new products other than what are really needed to meet our core mission. I'm not objecting to the work we're doing on the new round of gTLDs. I would be really concerned if we were looking at monetization as opposed to the processes which are really about enhancing the way that the Internet is growing and becoming more open, et cetera. That was my point.	Other suggestion	This 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	
168	PS-19	Lori Schulman	I'm wondering -- some of this might just be drafting criticism, but I think it also might reflect priorities. I would actually put strengthening cost management and financial accountability as 5.1, I would put the financial planning as 5.2, and I don't know that I'm clear about what "enhance ICANN's understanding of the domain marketplace" actually means unless I want to +1 Marilyn's comment about making sure that we're not monetizing for the sake of monetizing, delegating new gTLDs that could potentially fail. So I probably would advise a deeper dive or a rethink about what that means, "enhancing understanding of." You create the market in some respects. You know, you've got the pool. You delegate or don't delegate under certain circumstances. So I think -- I'm not even sure that that is part of your long-term financial sustainability. I think there's their needs to be a lot more clarification of that.	Other suggestion	Goals under objective on Financials have been re-shuffled and edited to clarify the strategic intent.	Yes	p. 25 to 29
169	PS-19	Lori Schulman	The other thing I don't see here, and I don't know if it's appropriate at this higher-level thinking, 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 I would, if it's appropriate, maybe add something in there about financial planning, as planning -- not enhancing the model but recognizing that there's investment as well as sort of this understanding of the marketplace. We need to -- I guess what I'm trying to say is figure out 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 outcomes have been edited.	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. ICANN's mission includes a statement that ICANN shall not act outside its mission. It's actually an interesting statement, not common in organizations. Given that some aspects of ICANN's mission are very tightly constrained within the mission statement for certain Internet identifier spaces, it's 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	