

present Draft Strategies

ICANN80 | PF – Board Led Community Engagement on the Draft FY26-30 ICANN Strategic Plan to present Draft Strategies

Thursday, June 13, 2024 – 15:30 to 17:00 KGL

EDMON CHUNG:

This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello, and welcome to the Board-Led Community Engagement on the Draft Fiscal Year '26 to '30 ICANN Strategic Plan to Present Draft Strategies. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for the session today will include French and Spanish. You may click in the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. For our panelists today, we kindly ask that they state the name for the record and please speak at a reasonable pace. Today, we will be taking questions from the audience both in person or from Zoom. Please feel free to ask questions until the presenters open the floor for questions. If you are in person, you may stand up in queue in front of the standing microphone to be given the floor. If you are on Zoom, please raise your hand to be given the floor. All participants may make comments in the Zoom chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chatbot and select “everyone” in this meeting. This will allow everyone to view your comments.

To view the real-time transcription, click on Show Captions button in the Zoom toolbar. Having said this, I will now hand the floor over to the BSPC co-chair, Maarten Botterman.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Welcome, everybody. Welcome to this session where we look at the future of ICANN, we look ahead beyond all the things you talked about this week, which have short horizon, are very important, what should be seen in longer perspective. And with Chris Chapman, I'm leading the Board Strategic Planning Committee. The members are here in front of the room to support this process as well. At this point, we are presenting a draft to you and we ask you for your input, your questions, and guidance that will help us to come towards full draft Strategic Plan for public comments formally some point later. Can you get the next slide, please?

These are the members. So, spot them in the room. And now you can always approach them individually as well. They will bring in your questions, concerns, and remarks as appropriate in our further preparation as well. Next slide, please.

We take it to where we are in the timeline, going back to how we started and where we are aiming to go. We then will review with you the draft vision statement on which we will ask you for your feedback. And after that, we'll go present to you the strategic objectives as we see today. And then also per strategic objectives, the goals and strategies. And fourth point, again, we will ask you for your questions, your feedback. The microphone in the middle is there to queue up and really help you use this. Of course, this isn't the only opportunity to provide questions and feedback and suggestions, do to us personally as well. Really feel free and know that there will be a formal one once

present Draft Strategies

the document is presented for search in the formal Public Comment period. Good. Next slide, please.

The project status and timeline. Next slide, please. So, basically, what we're doing here is not only because we think it's important, but it's also embedded in the 2016 original Bylaws firmly by the community to present a five-year Strategic Plan, accompanied with a five-year Operating Plan. We've committed to refresh all of these every year on an annual basis. We've been working to develop the draft and this is what we present to you. The current timeline for the full Strategic Plan just in highlight is to be ready before FY26 starts, thus no later than March 2025. Next one, please.

I would like to ask Becky if you're online to present for us the whole timeline where we started and where we going. Becky Nash is leaving the Org team supporting us in this development. Please, Becky.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you, Maarten. Hello, everyone. This is Becky Nash from ICANN Org Planning. And just to give a short update on the overall timeline for the development of the FY26-30 Strategic Plan, we first want to acknowledge that there was a significant amount of community involvement in a phase called the environmental scan. That was at ICANN78, where we ran many sessions during that time, and we collected information on the environmental analysis from the Org, Board, and the Community.

So where we are now, following the environmental scan and analysis phase, we then supported the Board Strategic Planning Committee

who started their work in developing strategies. So the strategy formulation phase ran from January through May, and the Board Strategic Planning Committee had over 13 working sessions to develop the draft strategic objectives, goals, and strategies. Following that time, that organization led by the Executive Team began to develop implementation strategies or implementation plans that will result in a five-year Operating Plan. So the draft plans have been under development from March through May. And where we stand today is a key in community engagement, and prior to finalizing the draft plans that will then go out for public comment in July. And just for the overall timeline, following the Public Comment period, which will run for more than 60 days, there will be the analysis of the comments received from the community and public. And then plans will be considered by the Board Strategic Planning Committee and the Board for updates.

As Maarten Botterman, the co-chair of the Board Strategic Planning Committee, indicated, we then move towards the plan consideration by the Board, and we expect adoption of these plans no later than March 2025. That then permits enough time for the Empowered Community process. So these plans, both the Strategic Plan and the Operating Plan, are subject to the Empowered Community process. Then that should run in the March-April timeframe. And should no petitions be raised, then these plans would be available to go in effect at the beginning of FY26. So this just gives a short overview of the overall timeline of the development of both the Strategic Plan and the Operating Plan. I'll pass it back to Maarten now. Thank you.

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Becky, for that. I'd like to move to the next slide. And the next slide. This is the working vision draft statement that we developed in January this year, and we share it with you, you've seen it at multiple occasions. So far it stands as is because apparently it's appreciated. The statement is "As the trusted steward of the Internet's unique identifier systems, ICANN is dedicated to strengthening the single, globally interoperable Internet for all," recognizing that this is something that we cannot do alone, but that we should be seen and recognized as just the steward because we are. Chris, anything to add there?

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Maarten said that it should be recognized as a vision that has stood the test of time over the last six months, and I think that's a fair observation. I'm glad it's a fair observation because the Board put a lot of thought into this. There were many permutations of what it might have meant, but it's a lot shorter. It's succinct and it's focused. And that focus has allowed us to galvanize around really what the next Strategic Plan needs to deliver and achieve.

It may be a nuance and it may be to you a unrecognized nuance, but there's a bit of attitude in this vision, although it's not over-the-top attitude. It could have simply said it's the steward of the Internet's unique identifier systems. It has responsibility for the single global interoperable Internet for all. But it's got a more positive posture than that. It acknowledges that we are the trusted steward. Now, we're not

present Draft Strategies

EN

getting above our station on that, but we are confident that we have that recognition to be trusted. But we obviously, in recognizing that, need to not only maintain it but enhance it. We're not only responsible for the single global interoperable Internet for all, but we are dedicating ourselves. We are, in effect, doubling down on our endeavors to be that, and not only maintain it, but strengthen it.

So from our perspective on the inside of the Board, I just wanted you to know that there's a very strong positive posture to this statement. We'd welcome comments on that because it may be that it's too nuanced. It's too understated. It may be that we haven't adequately conveyed that. So, thank you, Maarten, for the opportunity to say that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yes. These specific questions on the vision statement that have not been shared with us in the earlier stage, please use the microphone, or when you're in the Zoom Room, feel free to raise your hand or ask your question in the chat. Please, sir. And I'm sure that microphone should be turned on.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Good afternoon. My name is Pastor Peters Omoragbon, president of Nurses Across the Borders, an NGO with ECOSOC status with the UN and also an NGO that has observer status with the UNFCCC. My NGO is an ALS member in AFRALO from Nigeria. My contribution into the Strategic Plan has to do with what I believe should be an action item or could form part of the policy formulation by the Board. Until

recently, I wasn't too keen on the Universal Acceptance. But within the last few months, I've been involved at the level of my region in the committee. And then we had some of our open meetings, Monday, Tuesday on Universal Acceptance. [Inaudible] came that has to do with the number of languages that was approved or that will be used by the IDN project. There was argument around languages for content and languages to be used for the DNS.

Now, I've also had the opportunity to discuss with people who have been also been involved in trying to develop an appropriate language. I've spoken with one or two repertoires within the IDN when they were trying to look at the languages to be approved. I got to know that two parameters were used as to what language should be accepted. One was the official language, which are those languages used by the national government, state or provincial or regional governments to communicate with their residents. The other has to do with the number, any language that has about a million plus. I will be brief, but at the end, it means that is trying to develop, because most languages were taught to have the Latin script. So when they were looking at these parameters, they identified 200 languages. Because any language that is one less than a million did not fit into it. But the implication of this is that a large number of languages we use some form of the Latin script were missed out because of few letters or rather more letters plus diacritics.

So, my request, if ICANN is to make the plan for the multilingual plan for the Universal Acceptance more inclusive in line with your Strategic Plan Objective 1 and Objective 3, it'll be wise you lower your bar, so

present Draft Strategies

EN

that indigenous languages and indigenous communities you are also trying to include in this planning will not be left out. That is also what the United Nations recognized. So, we want the Board to look into this. Thank you very much.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Thank you, Pastor Peters, for your remark about language inclusion. I really appreciate it. Houda, please.

HOUDA CHIHI: Thank you so much. Hello, everyone. My name is Houda Chihi. I am ICANN Fellow alumni. Regarding the topic of DNS abuse, how the community could be more vigilant in the topic related to misinformation?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that. Thank you for the remark. This is really about the vision. That's first. Let's focus on that. But DNS abuse, you will see come back in later slides. And your remark is clearly noted. Also noting that we don't have a clock ticking, but please keep your remarks succinct and to the point. Please note that there's other ways to contribute as well.

Edmon, please. There's a question online, right?

present Draft Strategies

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Yes. I'm just reading out a comment from online from Lori Schulman. "The vision statement comports with other global governance initiatives. Agree with the positivity of the statement. I think it hits the mark."

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks, Lori, I would say. I appreciate it.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Thanks, Lori. And that might be a nice note to move on from the vision statement, because as Maarten said at the outset, and as Lori just encapsulated, she thinks it hits the mark. I don't know whether you picked up on what Becky Nash said that a lot of input from the Community, Org, and the Board has got us to this point. We're probably just over halfway. There was seven brainstorming sessions across the ICANN ecosystem in October, November. There were 13 Board Committee working sessions from January to May, and there have been 11 community engagement sessions from February to June. I say that for a reason. There's already been a lot of input and we've tabled a draft. But usefully, this session is about getting feedback from you. I'd like to say on behalf of Maarten and myself at the outset that any comments you make after you've considered them, obviously, constructively intended. So we're not going to be defensive about what we've tabled to date. We would love to hear anything and everything that you feel is relevant to the Strategic Plan, either by way of saying, "Yes, you've hit the mark," or what is what we call in

Australia or gob smacker, an omission. Cheryl, stop laughing. So if there's clearly something that is missing, if the tone is not positive enough, if it conveys the impression that we're complacent with the status quo, we would love you to point that out, because the great benefit of these sessions is to hold our work to date up to the flame and have a look. So I say that right out front on behalf of Maarten and as myself, we would just love to hear anything and everything you have to say constructively delivered, it will be very well received. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I don't take responsibility for the slogan in Australia, but I agree with everything else. So thank you. Can we move on to the next? We now dive into the strategic objectives, goals, and strategies. One further, please.

Basically, SSAD, this has been built on two blocks. One block is the Strategic Plan as you know it. The current Strategic Plan, a plan that has been developed six years ago, but also has been updated every year in interaction with the community. And the other part is the input from the environmental scan. The feedback we have received is available online for your review. We use that in our deliberations to come to where we are today. Next, please.

What we ask from you today is really these questions like, does it make sense? Is it aligned? Is it relevant for the coming five years? Is it strategic enough? We're focusing the strategic part here. The

present Draft Strategies

EN

operational part is something that will be addressed separately. Is there risk associated? And how do you measure it?

When we present the full Strategic Plan to you in its draft version, you will find the strategic objective, the goal, and the strategies explained. You'll also find the way we want to measure it and the risks that we see with it. At this moment, it's really for you to speak up on any you see. Of course, anything we missed at this point. I will first take you to the four strategic objectives we have, and then we dive into one by one, and at each of them, I will ask you for your feedback. Please, the next slide.

The first strategic objective is very much to do with our multistakeholder system and how it functions to sustain and promote ICANN's multistakeholder model and involve an inclusive Internet governance model. Now, here we refer explicitly to ICANN's model as the model as captured and encoded in our Bylaws. That is the basis for the way we work together. It is also very much about creating the environment and work better together.

The Strategic Objective 2 has to do with enhanced organizational excellence, recognizing that we are to serve a world, we need to do so with not increasing resources, but our tasks and our challenge as such gets more important by the day. So how do we tackle that effectively together?

The third one has to do with the evolution of the unique identifier systems, recognizing that where we were and where we are will not be where we'd be. So I'll go deeper into that when we get to that, but it's basically keeping track of technology development, making sure that

present Draft Strategies

EN

we continue to serve our mission to our best ability in terms of the way we use the unique identifier systems.

Last but not least is strengthen the security. The stakes go up, security challenges as well. And we need to make sure that this system continues to work. We need to back that firmly.

So these are the four. And now I'd like to take you to the next slide, the first strategic objective. Again, this is about the multistakeholder model. And here we talk about basically creating the environment that ensure that the right people are at the table, integrate new stakeholders, make sure they can work well together. Make sure this also is an attractive environment for new people, young people to come in and join. Supports the development of new generations of leaders. Don't wait until all current leaders grow old and retire. Got an excellent party yesterday with one of those leaders. And increase and broaden the participation of underrepresented communities. These are not typically coming directly. How do we make sure that these become part of what we do? That's the first one.

The second part is about work better together. Work better together internally by enhancing the agility and effectiveness of policy and advice development, recognizing that a mobile like ours does require certain steps in the process, but also making sure that when needed, we can react in a more agile way and take action even up into circles. So that includes strategies of reducing complexity, create incentives for participation, recognizing the many of us participate on a voluntary basis. Ensure early involvement rather than what we used to have in the past, I would say, because we were well on our way, that in a silo

policy is developed, an action is developed, the proposals developed. And then all the way when it gets to the community, then it first goes to the Board, the Board says yes or no, then it goes back to the rest of the community. All of this, we'd like to continue to further improve in terms of early engagement, taking Board liaisons on Board to help, make sure that the obvious questions are answered already beforehand. But also make sure that communities that have interest in certain topics talk together as we see today. Also inclusion of proactive engagement for government and inclusion of flexible, agile methodologies. One of those you may recognize that is already in place is that the development of the SFICR that is a specific fund that allows investment in subjects that come up shorter than the planning cycle and need to be addressed that we agree on that together.

So that's the internal side. The external side is to work together with those that make it happen with us. Demonstrate the value of ICANN's multistakeholder model, but also strengthen collaborative effort to promote the multistakeholder way of working in Internet governance. We are not the only one who use a formal stakeholder model in the Internet world. But together, we all believe that it's important to involve the stakeholders because no stakeholder can do what we do alone.

Any questions on the [inaudible] with creating the environment and work better together, both internally and externally? The floor is open for that.

present Draft Strategies

EN

EDMON CHUNG: We have a question. We have a hand from Michael Palage in Zoom.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thanks. Michael Palage for the record. Can you hear me?

EDMON CHUNG: Yes.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Excellent. Maarten and Chris, the question I have with regard to, if you will, 1.1, the representativeness, one of the things that I'm concerned about as a longtime ICANN participant is I see fewer and fewer people engaging and attending. And I think that directly relates to the health of the organization and the multistakeholder model. So one of the things that I think is important, and Jonathan Zuck always talks about this from a metric standpoint, could ICANN Org begin to take better metrics of the participation within individual stakeholder groups in what they're doing? Because perhaps that is one of the ideas to see where there may be a deficiency in stakeholder participation, then maybe this is something that ICANN could do. As we go forward, one of the things I heard from Sunday's session was the continued use of the word evolution. So as we look to continue to evolve and make the ICANN multistakeholder model better, having these metrics, I think, would be a good data point. Any thoughts or comments on that?

present Draft Strategies

EN

CHRIS CHAPMAN: I think the points are well made. I'd like to think that Strategies 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 1.1.5 are all a nod to the point you've made. When the public response opens up, we would welcome you to articulate that and perhaps provide some suggestions as to how that might work. So point well made. I think we're conscious of it. Love insights as to how you think that might happen. And I think Sally Costerton might want to add to that.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Michael, and thank you, Chris. Sorry, I seem to be juggling microphones. We've had a work track internally on this for a while. I think what Michael's talking about is certainly what we're talking about is mapping stakeholder participation, so that we understand who's doing what, this is what kind of participation activity is going on where in the world, where in the different stakeholder groups. And this has many benefits, partly to understand how we can provide maximum support for people, but also, of course, to really identify gaps, which I think is where the question comes from. So we're in the process of looking at how well we can do more than looking at it. We're designing a mechanism or dashboards to do that. And we will keep the community updated. But that's an active work process that's going on in the organization at the moment. Thank you for the question.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that. Next, Rosemary and then back to online.

present Draft Strategies

EN

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR:

Thank you. Rosemary Sinclair from .au. I want to make a comment about the multistakeholder strategic objective number one. And I want to just note that I'm making this comment in the absence of the environmental analysis and the risk assessment. And those are going to be two extremely important contexting elements in the Strategic Plan. If there's reflected in the environmental analysis and the risks a sense of urgency, then that would provide a context through which we could read the vision and the objectives. But I'd like to compare this objective statement about the multistakeholder model with some work that a group of community members have been doing that summarized in the technical community coalition for the multistakeholder model to demonstrate the sense of real urgency that we feel about this. And I'm just summarizing from a document.

Let me say the multistakeholder model ensures that decision-making about the Internet and its governance isn't led by individual nation-based political interests. However, the multistakeholder approach is under threat in a period of critical decision-making at the United Nations taking place across 2024 and 2025. There is a risk that the technical community and other key stakeholder groups will be left out of or have their voices weakened in dialogues related to the future of the Internet and its governance. And then there's a group of organizations, country codes, registrars, and others, who indicate what we're going to do about this. And the language that we use is we the undersigned are committed to defending, evolving, and strengthening multistakeholderism in decision-making and dialogues

present Draft Strategies

EN

about the Internet. It is imperative that the people who manage the Internet's operations are involved on equal terms as governments and other stakeholders in discussions, deliberations, and decisions about the Internet's future and its governance.

So when I look at the statement before us, I see a culture of caution, I see a focus on process. And to use the sporting analogy that we were using in the ccNSO discussion about this yesterday. I think we're pulling our punches on outcomes. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Rosemary, for that. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Reading out a comment from David Mackey, "Section 1.3. It would be nice to include the idea of expanding strategic alliances to advocate and educate. It's hard for ICANN to meet strategic objectives if the broader world doesn't understand what ICANN does and why it's important."

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that excellent suggestion. I think together between 1.3.1 and other activities, we may be able to fill it in quite comfortably. I appreciate it. Australia rules. Bruce Duncan, please.

BRUCE DUNCAN:

Thank you, Maarten. Just take a couple of comments on each of the columns, I guess. The first one, Strategic Objective 1 in the first word sustain, that to me feels a bit complacent. It feels like everything's pretty much okay, and all we need to do is promote the model. But from discussions I've had with people in the community, I don't think people think the model is working as well as it could. So stronger first word similar to the other strategic objectives, but I'd replace it with at the least enhance or strengthen or some similar word, because I think we've got to do work on our processes.

Then in the second column, 1.2 enhances the agility and effectiveness of the policy. And 1.1 is talking about ensuring inclusive representation. I think if you get 1.2 right, 1.1 will probably follow. So I'd almost reorder it and start with enhancing the agility of the ineffectiveness of the process.

And then going across to the right, your 1.2.1, you talk about incentives for participation. I think you need incentives for closure. Because what I observe now is you have incentives not to make progress. And where a policy might be implying either a drop in revenue or an increase in costs, the incentive is actually to draw it out. When you're paying travel funding for people to just keep meeting and talking about the same topic, the incentives to keep talking about the same topic, like the travel funding is fantastic, where in Rwanda would never have an opportunity to get here if not for ICANN holding this meeting. So our incentives are against closure. The incentive is actually to draw the process out, particularly if there's a cost

implication or revenue implication, so that you got to really think through that.

Then your last comment 1.2.4, and you're talking about agile methodologies, they work best when you've got a really clear objective that the agile team has agreed on. So if you're saying, "My objective is to find the fastest way to get from here to the airport," and a group of us agree, and then we can be agile. Should we use a bike or a car or whatever? But the objective is really clear. That's seldom the case in our policy processes. So I think agile will work if you've got the policy approved, and then you're implementing it. But agile itself, I don't think will solve your problem at the beginning, which is, you haven't got a shared objective and you don't have incentives to reach closure. So I'll leave it at that.

CHRIS CHAPMAN:

Thanks, Bruce. I think these notions that permeate Objective 1 and 2, in particular, and we're coming to two, about adaptability, agility, participation, active participation, more effective participation, and what you've just added to it, Bruce, in terms of closure are all themes that are intended to send a message to ICANN Org and to let the community know that we are extremely conscious of it. As we said yesterday, our consciousness about it, because we've seen it so many times, because we've said it to ourselves so many times, may not be adequately communicated to the community. And like yesterday, and this is an emerging theme today, we can do a lot better in communicating and taking a more positive tone about the way in

present Draft Strategies

EN

which the documents conveyed. So I appreciate those comments, Rosemarie and Bruce. Irina?

IRINA DANELIA: My comments and questions relate not particular to this objective but to all of them. Is that a good moment to bring them?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We hope to have time at the end for all of them. So, please, specific about all this now. In other words, later. Thank you. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: I have two comments here and one hand up. Should I do one by one? Okay. First one comes from Glenn McKnight. “I believe to meet the goals of 1.1.3. Foster an Appealing Environment for Younger Generations, comment suggest ICANN interact with the UN Dynamic Teen Coalition which is focused on 13- to 19-year-olds who grew up on the Internet. This group is active in the IGF and providing a voice to this neglected group.” There’s one more comment and a hand.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. I think that’s a very good suggestion. It’s working across and building collaboration with stakeholders also outside of ICANN. We clearly recognize that there’s an objective, so I appreciate the suggestion. Next one?

present Draft Strategies

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have a hand in the room from Lori Schulman.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hi. I'm actually not in the room, but I have a hand. Okay. I agree with what Bruce said, but I don't have the right verbiage yet. But my thoughts about Strategic Objective 1, I think it's too insular, actually. I would like to see something about promoting the multistakeholder model that's important, but understanding it's one of many multistakeholder models, not the model. I think one of the areas where ICANN falls down in relating to the rest of the world is that I think we tend to hold ourselves aside and above, and there are some good reasons for that in terms of remaining a neutral technical body. But at the same time, the influence and impact of ICANN is it's not some small island. It's a huge player. I would like to see our objectives and goals recognize that we're part of a greater global effort and not just sitting on their island. Again, how I would word that, I don't know, which is why I didn't put the comment in the chat because this is the idea. I think we would have to really work on wordsmithing for it, but I do think it's worth considering.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Thank you. I think we tried to tackle that. But let's make sure we did it well enough. Recognizing on one hand the Bylaw encoded multistakeholder model of ICANN, and the other hand, the need and willingness, commitment to work with the stakeholders to make

present Draft Strategies

things happen, both within but also outside ICANN. Let's make sure that's coming clear from the plan in the end. Thank you for your comment.

I would like to go slowly towards the other ones. But first, I would like to have Sebastien, and then the last two comments, and then we move to the next one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I'm going to speak in French, if I may. Absolutely. I hope that you have a headset. Let me go back on the same topic because I think it is truly important. We can talk about multistakeholder at ICANN. That is certain. But when we mention other instances, they are not models. Otherwise, everyone is a model. So that's a little bit complicated. So in point three, I think that we shouldn't be advocates for the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, but we must advocate for the multistakeholder model. That's it. It's a way to do things. It's not a model. And for 1.3.2, same thing. We shouldn't be talking about the MSM, but rather about the MS of Internet governance. And I truly think that, in particular, with the discussions at NETmundial, it was very helpful, because we showed that there wasn't a single way of doing multistakeholderism, but really all models should survive. Thank you very much, sir.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Next, please.

present Draft Strategies

EN

EDMON CHUNG:

This is a comment from Marius Andriamparany. “Strategic Objective 1. Try to include key concepts like attract new stakeholders, collaboration with new stakeholders, transparency, inclusive decision-making process, regular evaluation.”

There’s one more comment from Jordan Carter. “Just drawing a link between the importance of a stronger Objective 1 goal, and the views in the plenary on Monday about seeking a stronger stance by ICANN in dealing with this subject area. I’d support stronger language.”

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thanks for that. I really appreciate it. We’ll take that into account in our further steps. I’d like to go to the next slide. Thanks. I mean, this is not the wordsmithing area. This is where we try to be on outline and I really appreciate the input.

So the next one is a new one compared to what we’ve seen in the current one. It’s focusing on organizational excellence, recognizing that we do need to make sure that we continue to be able to deliver, and that will require the improvement of institutional agility and the ability to the needs of our community and the Internet that we serve. To preserve ICANN’s financial sustainability, make sure that we don’t spend more than we get on the long run. And on the global presence and impact, two things. One is to evolve the hybrid workforce model and regional office utilization to ensure we can serve the community at our best ability around the world without burning out the staff we have. And that ecological responsibility as a key issue that comes up

present Draft Strategies

EN

throughout the world, but also within our community, in our organization and Board, how can we make sure that we are ecologically responsible and how can we set goals to improve our ecological footprint time over time. As you are aware, there is a current CEO objective, annual objective that puts the basis for further work in this in place. And we look forward to sharing that later. So this is the key objective 2. Any additional?

CHRIS CHAPMAN:

I just might chip in there. It's nicely expressed, but if you cut to the chase on this objective, and in particular, 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, I just want to reiterate an assurance to community members that the Board is acutely aware of the need against increasing headwinds to be producing and delivering and closing out, again, quality outcomes with potentially less increase in funds in a much more timely manner. I encapsulated that way because I think they're the three elements. I'm just taking the opportunity to reiterate that assurance that the Board is acutely aware of it. And embedded in this objective is a good deal of that. Thanks, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

To continue, okay, you're not from Australia, which is sort of... Jordan Carter?

present Draft Strategies

EN

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. I think this is good. I like the ecological presence there. I think that's really important, given what the world is experiencing. Just a comment on 2.1.1. I hope we all read that and that it is meant to be focused at the entire ICANN system, community Board, etc., that this isn't just ICANN staffing institutional agility and adaptability. I think we can all look at the work we do whichever part of the ICANN family we're in to be more agile and adaptable. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I fully agree. If it will be only the organization, we wouldn't do a good job. We need to do it together.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have a question from the Zoom Room from Michael Palage.

MICHAEL PALAGE: My question goes to 2.2. I noticed in the press release with the new CEO, they said he will be based out of the Geneva office. Right now on the ICANN website, it references Geneva as an engagement center. So does the Board envision that an engagement center changing its profile to an office? Or is that too early to say?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for the question. First, it's not directly on the Strategic Plan. But yes, there will be something that is forthcoming and needs to be worked out. As you will understand, we just concluded the agreement

present Draft Strategies

with [Curtis Lenfest] to serve us from 5th of December onwards. And more news about that I will say later. Thank you for your question. Rosemary?

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR:

Thanks, Maarten. I wanted to reflect on a very recent conversation that we had in the ccNSO yesterday at the Internet governance Liaison Committee. The topic of that session was how ccTLDs contribute to a better world in pursuit of UNSDGs. We heard an amazing series of presentations which went to the broader ESG framework within which there were wonderful examples of ecological responsibility.

So my suggestion is that in thinking about Objective 2.2.2 that there may be some thought given to broadening that particular objective, albeit focusing on environmental matters. And just the other thing I wanted to mention is there is in fact ESG CEO Forum that we have pulled together informally that meets at most ICANN meetings adjacent, where CEOs from country code managers and other organizations share information on what they are doing in their organizations around ESG and UNSDGs. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you very much for that, Rosemary. First, we'd love to be in touch with the ESG CEO Forum and make sure that we get the input and connect. Because this is also something we try, we will develop in interaction with the community while we work on the baseline right now. On ESG, yes, we have ESG in mind when we think of the specific

subject. And the focus is on ecological because our governance is very well-defined. You will see that on the S, we also have in our annual plan reports on balance and things, for instance, in gender across regions. So here the focus is really on this as something new. We're aware of the broader ESG requirement growing around the world for a good reason, and we will follow that. So I appreciate your comments. I would love to continue to learn from experiences elsewhere. I've been witnessing an excellent presentation by AFNIC on this, by the way. I'm sure there's more. Please, a normal Australian, Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Maarten. When I saw this yesterday at the strategic objective level, I understood. And I guess for many of us, we've become socialized to the organization, meaning ICANN Org. So I saw it as referring to ICANN Org, and therefore, underpinning the other three strategic objectives. Now, as I've heard it today, it may not be just ICANN Org, it's something broader. I may be alone on this. But for me, these lozenges or these different groupings with the sub bullets don't hang together in a coherent way. So it's hard for me to—it's not up to me and it would be very difficult standing up here to try and rejigger it. But I'm just telling you, because I know, Chris and Maarten, you want to hear how it comes across, and it doesn't thread together clearly for me. And I know from yesterday, I spoke with you about with my view that the financial sustainability or stability point should come up to the top of and be the fifth bullet on the strategic objectives. And actually, I'm not just trying to bang that drum for the sake of it, I

happen to think that it is essential and a core strategic objective for the organization to have its financial stability at the very top of its strategic objectives. But as I look at it here, and as I say, I'm not trying to rework it now, but even plucking that out would make it seem for me more whole. But somehow, it's not gelling to me. As I said, I'm not understanding whether it's the organization, the whole of the ICANN group. I would say it needs some rethinking in that way. And I'd be happy to put my head to it. But clearly, now is not the forum for doing that. So I apologize that it's not the most focused intervention. But as I said, I heard from you yesterday that you were very keen to hear how it lands. So that's how it appears to me.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yes, it is. Thank you for your comments and your guidance there. The Strategic Plan as a whole is for the Community, Organization, and Board. And indeed if we talk about hybrid workforce model and regional office utilization, it is particularly focused on the Org. About institutional agility alone, the Org would not work. That would need to work hand in hand. But we take those considerations into account. At this moment, ICANN financial sustainability is not seen as at the top level. It's because we got very healthy reserves. That was not the case when we developed the previous plan. We had a very insufficient reserve. So we need to continue to observe and act. But we are good, and we need to keep it like that. So thank you for your comments.

present Draft Strategies

EN

DAVIS WAITHAKA:

Thank you. For the record, my name is Davis Waitthaka from the Taking Schools Online program Elimu Holdings and .ke in Kenya. My comment is on the 2.1 pursue a sustainable future, and specifically 2.1.2. As we know, the very base of the Internet plays billions of web sites across the world. And there is an emerging threat to the existence of millions of those websites because we know that degenerative AI and usually degenerative such AI is taking a lot of traffic from those websites. And what we've been seeing from a lot of studies is that the traffic is moving from the millions of websites to maybe just a handful of websites. I don't mention them by name. But just a handful of websites are taking a huge amount of the traffic that was going to the millions of websites that eventually help sustain ICANN. So I hope that somewhere along this Strategic Plan, you're going to have a comment on how ICANN is going to evolve in the face of AI. There's nothing we can do about technological improvements. But we can always look at how to react ourselves, and for the billions and billions of websites that may be affected negatively or positively, and then how ICANN can help in that case. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you very much for your very well-pointed remark. The truth is we don't know. This is why we assume at the moment that kind of stable funding trend, we are conservative in our estimates we've always been. And if there are trend breaches, we cannot predict them because it could go either way, right? So for that reason, we also are committed to continue to update and to follow. And if such trends

present Draft Strategies

become clearer, we will need to adapt our Strategic and Operational Plan. So thank you for your input.

CHRIS CHAPMAN:

We better get on with Objective 3, I think.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Next slide, please. The next slide is about the unique identifiers. And again, something to do in collaboration with the relevant stakeholders to evolve to unique identifier systems that together make the Internet work. That includes also facilitation of digital inclusion. I heard a remark from the gentleman on languages. And of course, it needs to start with people being able to use that in terms of IDNs and Universal Acceptance, also need to ensure that there's a continued growth in choice and innovation is possible, all embracing inclusivity.

Secondly, it's to say up to changes, evolve the identifier system landscape understanding, make sure we continue to understand and are on top of how this is changing and how we should adapt our systems, and understand new technologies. And again, there the gentleman with his remark about AI is right. AI can be a tool for DNS, it can be a threat for DNS, it's something that may need to be addressed. These are other topics. By the way, you can also find regularly reports on the side of ICANN's OCTO, exploring these new technologies, and for sure that continues to be a strategy priority.

Then last but not least, IANA functioning. Delivering and enhancing the IANA and the functions to meet the evolving needs is key. It's at the

present Draft Strategies

core of what we do. So with this, I'd like to invite again any comments. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG:

This is a comment from Bill Jouris, in fact, actually in response to Pastor Peters earlier. "Of the several thousand languages using the Latin script, the Latin LGR (Label Generation Ruleset) is based on just over 200 languages. We at the Latin GP looked at A, official languages those in which a national regional state government routinely does business, and B, those languages with more than one million native speakers. The number one million being obviously completely arbitrary, adding the letters and/or letter plus diacritic from the missing languages wouldn't be that huge of an effort. I would guess one person full-time for about a week I estimate that I could do it in my spare time after my day job in about a month. Checking the new letters for possible variants shouldn't take more than that, about the same length of time either."

I will add myself that I guess what Bill is saying to the gentleman earlier is that to work with the Latin Generation Panel in adding those languages into the future is not set in stone, and this is part of the strategic objective here as well.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you for that and for your comment, Edmon. Irina, please.

present Draft Strategies

IRINA DANELIA: Irina Danelia. I am with .ru ccTLD. Just for my personal curiosity, in this structure where the next new gTLD round will fall under which point? Or is it considered a part of operating implementation and not a part of strategy? Because it's enormous in terms of resources project is not somehow indicated in the strategy.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We had earlier remarked where the ask was how can we relate current activities and upcoming activities to the Strategic Plan. That makes such a clear point where these things come together seem to make a lot of sense. We are thinking how to make that happen. For now, just my thinking is that you will find that in particular back in 3.1 both in the IDN side simulation as in the cultivate consumer choice, competition, inclusivity, and innovation. I think that will be the main area that links to this. Xavier agrees, so we are good.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Edmon, any more?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: In which case, we go to Strategic Objective 4. After we have talked about that, all questions are welcome.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Edmon, you are doing a very good job in moonlighting as a facilitator.

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you so much. Again, at the core of what we do, if we don't do it without ensuring that the security is ensured, we have a problem. So strengthening the security of the Internet unique identifier system is therefore identified as one of the key strategic objectives. We see that both the need to reinforce the shared responsibility, to uphold the security and stability by the DNS, by strengthening the DNS coordination as the need to strengthen the DNS root server operations governance.

Now, we have had feedback already that what is currently missing is a strategy that is more focused on how can we help, what is our role in ensuring that numbers also get reflected? We are thinking how we can put that best in. Other than that, we do see the need to provide and participate in trusted forums. Make sure there is a place where you can rely on the information and make things happen together. Identify and mitigate security threats. Again, this is something that you need to do in coordination in partnership with others. On the root server operations, ICANN is a root server operator too. It works with independent other root server operators. There are strategies on evolution of the governance and technical development of root server operations and services, robust roots zone generation, distribution services, and support coordination plans to attack—to address attacks, not to attack. Sorry for that. Let's not attack the root services together.

present Draft Strategies

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Just to underscore what Maarten said and to illustrate that this is a evolving or a living document, as much as that term is overused, the Board in its workshop the other day realized that this is underdone on the numbering side. So there will be a reference there in 4.1.2 numbering. Not ready for publication today, but it will be. I say that because there's lots of scope for amendments, enhancements, changes. I'll leave it at that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Any questions, suggestions, remarks? I see some smiles.

JABHERA MATAGORO: Thank you. This is Dr. Matagoro from Tanzania and a member of AFRALO. I'm just thinking if we can say strengthening the security, stability, and the resilience rather than just generalizing both with only one way of security because those could also be relevant at this point. Thank you. I should also declare that I was also a member of the Review Team on SSR2. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Irina, you were earlier wanting to make a comment about all four objectives. This is your moment.

present Draft Strategies

EN

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you very much, Chris. At the moment I'm speaking. I'm Irina Danelia, associated with .ru country code registry and I'm also vice chair of ccNSO Strategic and Operating Planning Committee. We had a great session yesterday between ccTLD managers and members of Board Strategic Planning Committee. Thank you very much for that. I want to reiterate two points from that session.

First, ccTLD managers strongly suggest that ICANN includes in its Strategic Plan a risk assessment and SWOT analysis which was used as a basis for suggested strategic objectives. Secondly, it was noted that proposed draft plan presents objectives as more than a process rather than a target where ICANN is going to come. We suggest to add more concrete description of what the target state for ICANN would be by 2030 and what would be the measurable KPIs for that.

In addition, I have two questions which we had no time to ask yesterday, if I may. The first question is to what extent these objectives will have impact on the CEO goals? The second question is to what extent there was a retrospective review of the current Strategic Plan which was about to end? And how the successful factors have been adopted for the upcoming cycle? Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you for that. As for the CEO, when he arrives, he finds the Strategic Plan in development. And it will be well developed and we will be looking forward to his insights as well to help further develop it. I would say it just fit one on one.

present Draft Strategies

EN

-
- CHRIS CHAPMAN: And clearly, delivery on the Strategic Plan goes to the heart of the CEO's goals. There's no question about that.
- What was your second question? I didn't quite pick that one up. I'm sorry.
- IRINA DANELIA: The second one was about the outcome of the current five-year cycle and what's the analysis of how objectives are achieved done? What are the outcomes to take into the future plan? Success factors probably?
- CHRIS CHAPMAN: Thank you. As Maarten mentioned at the beginning, the full Strategic Plan will contain a number of additional items, including risk assessments, risk observations, currently called measurements, but ultimately our assessment tools and benchmarking of performance that will be in the Strategic Plan. The Operating Plan will give an insight as to the waiting in a time period over that five years, whether it's imminent, needs to be concentrated in the first year, whether it's steady state over the five years, whether it's a mid-term objective throughout that five years. These will all be part of the full Strategic Plan.

present Draft Strategies

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to complement that, when we come with a paper for public consultation, it will be the full papers, not just the headlines that we present to you today. It will be explained per strategy as well. And you will find also what we see in ways of how do we measure that and which strategic risks do we see. That all is subject to the public consultation.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Irina, did we cover your three questions? Or two? A beautiful consolidation exercise from yesterday, well done. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: This is a comment actually that came in a little bit late when we were talking about Objective 1. It's about Objective 1. It is from Doreen Nandutu Nabuzale, "I believe 1.1.3 should not only focus on an appealing environment that go ahead to create intentional avenues for awareness even for students as early as universities, especially here in Africa. Personally, I found out about ICANN through an ITU training."

And then there are two hands up as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The first hand is, I believe, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'll come after the next presentations or questions.

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay then. Xavier is skipping his turn.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The next hand I have in the Zoom room is Michael Palage.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Michael, please.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. This question goes to, I guess, the entire Strategic Planning Committee. Yesterday, Sally in her interactions with the ccNSO raised the issue of perhaps reducing the number of in-person ICANN meetings from three to two. As someone who has only missed, I think, five or six in-person meetings, I've actually participated remotely this one. I feel that there's been minimal difference if I was there. I would applaud ICANN for how they have enabled virtual participants. I think that that is something that the Board should consider as part of its Strategic Plan. Myself, Becky, and Jeff, and others, remember the first two years of ICANN, we were actually doing four in-person meetings a year, which was incredibly taxing. I think with the new capabilities that ICANN built out during COVID, perhaps reducing the carbon footprint and the need for in-person meetings is something that should be considered. But not before we go to Prague next summer. There you go.

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please, Sally, you want to respond?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thanks, Maarten. Thank you so much, Michael, because you've given me another opportunity. I think we planned this ahead of time to just say something about this topic. I didn't actually suggest that we were looking at reducing to two meetings a year. But you're absolutely right, the subject of how we meet, which includes the ICANN meetings that were the big three, but also other meetings that we have as a community during the year. I'm asking, and I've talked to some of you already, but you'll get communications through your SO/AC structures and the Policy Support Team. We're going to have—I'm going to call it a community conversation over the summer, very of light and informal, to have exactly that kind of dialogue, Michael. So it's really great to get your feedback. And that's exactly—I'd love to incorporate those comments, discussion exactly into that conversation. We'll finish that off around about the end of August, collect everybody's thinking and ideas. It's very, very much just gathering in that comment. And then we'll come back to the community with a kind of, "Okay, here's what we heard." And maybe it's time for us to have, I think, a different way that we might do things. I just wanted to use the opportunity to let everyone know that you're right and you're ahead of me. Thank you very much.

present Draft Strategies

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Also noting very much your positive remarks. I think we all share that the fact that these meetings are now hybrid and very well facilitated in that way, that makes it possible. Thank you for that. I see one hand up. Claire Craig, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Hi. I am Claire Craig for the transcript record. I am one of the vice chairs of the ALAC but I am speaking on my own behalf. I particularly like these strategies. And this is a comment, not a question. I like Strategies 1.2.4, incorporate flexibility and agility methods in the policy and advice development and implementation cycle. And as well as 2.1.1, improve institutional agility and adaptability. I am just looking forward to see what the KPIs would be to achieve these, considering that ICANN appears to have a very low threshold for risk. The more risk averse you are, the less agile you tend to be and the more bureaucratic. I look forward to seeing how this thing plays out. Thank you.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Thank you for that. We'll take that as a comment, as you suggested. Thank you. That was very helpful. It's not unrelated to the question/observation that Jordan made earlier about not only institutional agility, but agility and policy development. We're very much alive to that. Whilst organizational excellence didn't pick up the policy development and advice development implementation agility,

it's certainly part of it. Alan's brought my attention—sorry, I should add that Jim Galvin, as the new chair of the Risk Committee, is very much alive to having a much more, again, calibrated assessment and feel for risk across the organization, rather than a one-stop shop application of low risk across the organization. There needs to be a much more mature and courageous discussion about risk tolerances in different parts of the organization and in different parts of the community. James, I think that's encapsulated. You're happy with that? Finally, Alan brought my attention to the fact that in the chat, there's a further observation about the lack of reference to numbers. I think I addressed that earlier when I suggested that we've observed that and we will be addressing it. Thank you again for that observation. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, there's one hand still left. Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I will make a few comments in French. I just wanted to mention that the numbering of the Strategic Objectives 1 to 4 as a goal strictly to identify the strategic objectives, but it is not to prioritize or it does not rank them in order of importance. Do not read in this numbering system any indication that the first objective, number one, might be more important or might be a priority.

Second comment, I wanted to respond to Rosemary and Irina's points regarding risks. The current Strategic Plan does contain risks in terms

of strategy. It will also be the case for this plan. We didn't want to put too much information in the slides, so we didn't include the risks in the slides that you have here, but it will be included in the information that will be submitted for public comment.

Last comment, we also received a lot of feedback on the use of having the analysis of strengths, risks, and threats that was done after receiving the results of the environmental scan, so revised the decision to publish the information because of all of the feedback that we received. Then one last thing on the plan, the Strategic Plan that you see here has a goal to define the strategic objectives, the way to reach those objectives, and what will be done by all of us in order to reach those objectives. That is the idea in the Operational Plan. It is a plan that comes in complement to the strategic objectives. And if the strategic objectives answer the question of where are we going, the Operational Plan answers the question of how do we get there. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHRIS CHAPMAN:

Xavier, thank you. I'm glad you made the last point about the Operational Plan. Indirectly related to what you touched on, I think that it's fair to say that some of the observations yesterday and again today give us cause for pause as to how we might better connect the dots on SWOT analysis, where we were, where we need to be. I just want to acknowledge that at this point. Maarten?

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: This is a question from Muhammad Altaf, “I am Muhammad Altaf, an ICANN80 Fellow. How does the Strategic Plan ensure that it addresses the challenge of regions like Africa with more focus and attention? Because certain regions need more focus, support and capacity building for obvious reasons.”

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think that’s clearly recognized. And you also see it back in activities like the Coalition for Digital Africa and actions across the world like KINDNS where we support this. Also, in addressing for the new round and, for instance, the grant program, we seek to ensure that it doesn’t only stretch to the part that is most served by the Internet but also to the rest of the Internet. So your remark is very well taken and is a priority in what we do. And if you feel it’s not well enough reflected once you see the full plan, please let us know.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: As Maarten says, if you don’t think 1.1.5 adequately addresses the point you’re making, then we’d love to hear from you in the Public Comment period. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Then the last one I would like to take is all the remarks that are relating to what do we do with meetings? Are we going to two or one or three or five? I think it's a good conversation, but it's a conversation to be had by the community in which the Board and the Org don't have to lead will have the need to facilitate. Facilitate effects and facilitate with maybe some suggestions and by leading by example and sharing what we do in that way. This is going to be a longer process, but for sure we will not mandate this from the top. This is what we need to do together. Possible outcomes could also be that within the community, there's a better rationalization of who needs to be in the room and who can be in the Zoom Room. One outcome. Another one could be a different work more regionally and maybe connect regionally more that way. Another outcome is that we stay as we are. We are open to that, but we should be conscious of that and the numbers the organization is collecting beginning to facilitate this discussion with. I can see that next to travel budget, we may have a carbon usage budget or something in the future. Something like that. With that, I see one more person standing up. Lawrence, three minutes before the end of the session, you're the last requester. Please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you and I'll try to make it very brief. I wasn't intending to step forward. First of all, my name is Laurence Olawale-Roberts. I'm a GNSO councilor and a member of the BC. But at this point, I'm speaking in my individual capacity.

My response was triggered by the last question that came in. It appears that there might be some unintended barriers and difficulties created especially those from the developing regions based on our work and what we do. I say that because it was just only about three, four weeks ago that some of us got to know that to participate in the forthcoming RSP evaluation, it will come with a cost of about \$92,000. That converts to over 200 million in Naira, and definitely that's a huge barrier for any African entity that was considering stepping forward to be so evaluated. Even for the operating ccTLDs, this will also remain a barrier. It's possible that in the course of the work that we do, certain challenges are thrown out there that might exclude certain demographics from being able to effectively participate. I believe that these issues will be well addressed. I just wanted to put it out there. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Lawrence. You're part of the policymaking in this. For sure, the Applicant Support Program should make a difference. This is not about this short-term issue, but I hear your concern. It does fit in the longer-term perspective of inclusiveness and addressing the underprivileged regions or the ones who are not fully online. So I appreciate it.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. If I could just ride on that. The major concern is that that evaluation is supposed to open up, I believe, in the next three to four

present Draft Strategies

EN

months, which gives a very, very limited time to be able to adjust to that situation. Also, it happened to come out when all the applicants support and whatever had been dealt with. But I want to believe that this was unintended but I want to put it out there that there are certain things that happen in our process that causes some of us from the developing regions to be blacked out. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I hear you. Thank you for that. More communication on this in relation to the next round, no doubt, follow.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Lawrence, well done. You've got the whole Board here so you've been successful. We've got one minute to go. We'll try and get through the very last question. No questions? One more comment. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: This comment is from Jasmine Ko, "there have been suggestion that even ICANN keep all three meetings annually, there could still be consideration of one change to online meeting among the three to reduce total carbon footprint. Meanwhile, ICANN may be more considerate on in-person meeting logistics such as avoid single use plastic or glass, etc., or create environment that people is aware of their consumption."

present Draft Strategies

EN

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Okay. That's a comment we've already addressed that earlier. But again, welcome contribution. I'm going to hand over to Maarten to close the session out. I just wanted to reiterate the invitation to feed in any and all observations, queries, suggestions when the Public Comment period is open. Don't only come with questions at that time but come with proposed solutions and wording because time will be of the essence during that period.

Thank you for participating. From my perspective, I have enjoyed today, I enjoyed yesterday. Those who spoke yesterday spoke as eloquently today as they did yesterday. Maarten, over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you so much. Thank you everybody for your active participation. We've heard it, the Board Strategic Planning Committee members have heard it, and you've heard each other. I think together we'll be able to step forward beautifully. I think we haven't heard game breakers so we're still on plan, I think to, deliver by—

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Gob smackers.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Is that Australian? That is for half of the commenters today.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: We'll take that up at the drinks.

present Draft Strategies

EN

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you all very much. It's been a great pleasure, and looking forward to see you again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. With that, we'll close the session and stop the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]