KOBE - High Interest Topic: ICANN Strategic Planning
Monday, March 11, 2019 - 10:30 to 12:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

GORAN MARBY: Welcome to this high-interest session. We'll start in about two minutes. So if you'll take your seats.

Welcome, everybody, to this session on the strategic plan. This is a high-interest session, and we look forward to sharing with you the current state of the strategic plan, which has been put out for public comments. And this is actually the tail end of those public comments. So we really look forward to your remarks, questions, and suggestions at this point.

With me are my colleagues with whom we've been developing part of the rationale of this in response to what we've heard from the community.

And I'll introduce them one by one when we start speaking.

My name is Maarten Botterman. I'm with Matthew Shears, chairing the board working group that has been working on this. And we've been -- we've had excellent support from Nathalie on the right and Theresa Swinehart next to her from org.

So the speakers today are Cherine Chalaby, who will talk about the mission, the vision; and Merike Kaeo, a well-known expert in the community as well on security, and she will cover that part. Becky Burr will talk with us about the governance; Tripti Sinha, about the evolution of the domain name system. Leon Sanchez, about the global governance issues, because we are part of one world and not isolated in that. And last, but not least, our Board Finance Committee chair, Ron Da Silva, will focus on the sustainable finance.

So, Matthew, can you take us through the outline.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Maarten. It's a pleasure to be here.

So the purpose of this session is really twofold: It's to provide an update in terms of the comments that have been received as a part of the public comment. It's to provide an opportunity to go through again the process that we use to get to where we are today. But most importantly, it's about an opportunity for you to provide us with your feedback on the plan.

We will be raising some questions with you to get your initial feedback. But we welcome questions on the strategic objectives as we go through them.

So let me just talk a little bit about the agenda in more detail.

So we'll spend the first 15 minutes or so reviewing a strategic planning process and looking at the comments received. We'll spend the bulk of the time, really, in a discussion. And we hope this will be a very fruitful, interactive discussion. And we'll go through the vision, the mission, the strategic objectives. And we have our board colleagues here to answer your questions on those specific strategic objectives.

And then we'll wrap up with kind of a summation of what we've heard today and what the next steps are. And we'll close at that point in time. And we'll make sure that you have an opportunity to speak.

If there are questions that you still -- that you haven't asked or had an opportunity to ask, just please forward them to us. Back to you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. And for that purpose, there's two microphones. Just to provide you the deeper context, Theresa, would you like to remind us of the strategic planning process that brought us here.

THERESA SWINEHART: Sure. I'd be happy to. Thanks, everybody, for joining. And thanks for also your input throughout this entire process.

So on the slide here, you see something that's quite familiar. And if it's a repetitive thing for some, my apologies. But I think it's important that we have a full understanding what all this entails.

The -- as you know, the bylaws prescribe that we produce several planning documents as part of our planning cycles, the first being the five-year strategic plan. And, essentially, the strategic plan indicates the desired future or what we call the vision, and translates this vision into broadly defined objectives and goals. That is, the "what."

The strategic objectives themselves and the goals are articulating the path from where we are and where we want to be with each strategic goal, of course, comes targeted outcomes and strategic risks, which are determining the conditions of success.

The strategic plan itself is complemented by a five-year operating and financial plan. And you heard Cherine discuss this this morning.

That describes how we will get there and at what cost, that is, costing out the process around this.

And this then further gets refined into the annual operating plan and into the budget, the planning cycles themselves and with monitoring and evaluating how we are doing, so we can make adjustments as necessary.

EN

So the strategic plan is really the first step towards a costing action plan and more details that have to be worked out with the interactions with the community in the five-year operating and financial plan exercise.

And as the work progresses on the development of the five-year operating and financial plan, some adjustments of any sort of ambitions within the strategic plan may be necessary. So it can be iterative and make sure that that is an iterative and living aspect of it.

Thank you. Thanks.

So where are we in the process now?

As many of you participated in over the past year, we began with the trends exercise, the strategic outlook, trying to identify what are some trends and what are some themes that are emerging. And we ran many sessions with the community, with the board, and with the organization. And this is an ongoing process for us to keep track of sort of where we see trajectories going.

The second phase consisted in typical strategic planning analysis, and we are going to come back to that in just a little bit.

And the third face has just concluded, the drafting of the plan. And the draft was posted for public comment. And that consultation ended recently, on February 25th.

The staff report in relation to that will be put out after this session here, because we felt that this session here is an important part of that conversation.

And we're now starting the fourth and last phase towards finalizing the plan. After Kobe, we will take all the comments, including today' discussions and revise the strategic plan and the board will consider the plan for adoption by the time frame.

The public comment period has just ended. And I'm now going to ask Nathalie, my colleague, to give a summary of the comments that we've received.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE: The public comment on the draft strategic plan was opened for 67 days, from end of December to end of February. And we received 15 submissions, including five from individuals and ten from organizations and groups.

I've broken down the submissions that we've received into 145 comments. And you can see them in the pie chart in the middle of the screen. The comments were quite evenly distributed between the different components of the strategic plan.

A majority of the comments were very supportive. We got 48 comments indicating support and 38 indicating support with some proposed edits. Only seven concerns were raised. And the

remaining 52 comments can be characterized as either suggestions or observations.

So a little bit more about the content of the -- those public comments. I've listed here a few points that summarize what we've heard.

So first, it must be noted that there was a broad acknowledgment that this plan was created with a lot of input of community members. So great community engagement throughout the development of this plan.

Commenters indicated that they were mostly comfortable with the five trends that had been identified. And there is an overall -- overall support of both the proposed visions and the five overarching strategic objectives.

Several questions were raised about the process that was followed to develop the plan and the methodology that was adopted to prioritize the strategic goals and for identifying the outcomes and risks. And I believe Matthew is going to speak to this a little bit more after this.

And, finally, a lot of constructive feedback on specific elements of strategic goals, targeted outcomes, and risks.

I want to end with a note on the staff report. The staff report on public comments was technically due today, March 11th. We've

opted to delay its publication until after this session so that today's comments can be included, addressed, and taken into account in the report. So you can expect the staff report on this public comment proceeding to be published shortly after ICANN64.

With that, Matthew, do you want to walk us through the process a little more?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Nathalie.

You will have probably seen or many of you will have seen this slide or a variation of it in previous sessions. But as Nathalie said, we had some questions in the public comment asking what was the process we used, did we use a slot analysis, et cetera. So we thought it would be useful just to go through the process once again so you have a full understanding.

It's fair to say that on the board, there is considerable experience in strategic planning. And what we did is we adopted more classic strategic planning process and then adapted that to more of a consultative multistakeholder process. And you can see that process here. So many of you were involved in the trends sessions. We had 25 of them that involved the community, the board, and the organization. We had over 1,000 inputs.

Those inputs were then categorized, they were analyzed, they were researched further and validated. And preliminary findings were presented to the board.

And we had some additional synthesis of those findings when we had gaps in our research.

And those resulted in these five kind of focus areas, if you will, that you can see in the middle of the slide: Security, ICANN's governance, unique identifier system, geopolitics, and financials.

Then we went through the second phase, which was really what do we do with those -- those buckets, and how do we form them into strategic objectives. And we did further trend analysis. And we went through a series of marketplace analyses. We did some projections as to what these trends might look like in the future in different market kind of scenarios, if you will. And then we did a pretty comprehensive SWOT analysis of those findings. And that's what got us to the strategic objectives and the goals for fiscal year 2021 to 2025.

Overall, it was a lengthy process. And we had considerable input from the community. And that's been incredibly helpful in bringing this to the point where we are today.

And I think that's been a fantastic expression of our multistakeholder contribution to this strategic planning process.

Maarten, back to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you.

So this introduction is the background against which we are going to discuss the strategic plan itself.

We will present the slides one by one. And the people who will present the specific slide have studied in-depth the comment step came with that, we discussed them yesterday, and really look forward to hearing additional views from you.

We will first look at the vision which is proposed, the mission as is in the bylaws, and obviously we have quoted that. And after that, we go into the strategic objective areas one by one.

For the vision, Cherine, would you be willing to present that?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes.

Thank you, Maarten.

As you probably heard me this morning, a lot of comments you provided are going to do and likely result in some changes to some of the details of the plan. But the -- there was support, broad support from the community on the overarching direction,

and particularly on the vision. It's -- it is important that we all unite around a vision like this, because it's really renewed our sense of purpose. And this vision is clear. It's different from the old one. The old one said we need to be international and provide offices everywhere and also have a multistakeholder model and so on and all these important things. But we've achieved quite a lot of what we said before. This is a renewed sense of purpose. And it's about our role -- if you say what is really our role, we want to be a champion of that single Internet, together with our colleagues, the technical community, each one working within his own remit.

So I think there is a broad agreement now that the overarching vision is the one we want to go for. But we've received a lot of comments on some of the details. And I think -- I want to thank the community, because those comments were very, very useful and very valuable. And I can say to you that we will incorporate most, if not all, of them.

And the comments came particularly at the bullet points below the overarching vision. So, for example, the first one, the bullet point was secure operation and access of the IANA function. And the change required by the community is "ensure operation acce-
-- in the stewardship," which is much more accurate. So thank you for that.

The same goes with the evolving the ICANN multistakeholder model to remain. But the community wants even more, wants to increase the efficiency of it and the transparency and the accountability. So we incorporate that change as well.

The third one was, improve the effectiveness of our multistakeholder model. And the changes were -- was, make sure you put the word "inclusiveness" so that we don't forget that there is an inclusive model, and was quite right. And thank you for that.

And also make sure that the word "multistakeholder" is still there. And if you remember, in my speech this morning, I said, whatever we do, there will be no compromise whatsoever to our much-valued bottom-up, consensus-building, inclusive decision-making process. So those changes actually strengthened that bullet point.

And I think that was about it. There were a couple of others, but I think by and large, we proposed to incorporate all of the changes that were suggested. A lot of them were very similar, so you don't see all of them here. But they were very similar. So we want to thank the community for your participation and your input and your support for this new overarching vision, which really is the glue that's going to keep us all together. That strategic planning document, if you look at the community as a stockholder, the

board below, and then ICANN org, three of us are bound together by the bylaws and our strategic -- strategic planning.

So thank you very much.

Happy to take any questions.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And we will take questions at each step of this and at the end, if we have time left, we will just allow questions on anything. And that way, you can also time the point you want to step up to the microphone and contribute.

As there's nobody stepping up, I suggest we move on to a short presentation of the mission, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes, so the strategic plan consists of three things: The mission -- sorry, the vision, the mission, and five objectives.

We said all along that what is new is only the vision, that the mission, which was really detailed and incorporated into our bylaws during the transition, is something which is at the moment sacrosanct, we're not going to touch, and will not be changed. So we proposed that that mission statement is incorporated into our strategy as it is without a single change. And I think there's broad support on that. So I don't -- we didn't

even get many comments, because I think that was given as a de facto. So we appreciate that. At least you've confirmed our thinking and your thinking. And that reflects sort of a joint agreement between us, the community, and ICANN org, the mission statement that was -- the bylaws and the mission statement rewritten post the transition or during the transition will remain the same.

I'm happy to take any questions on that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I'm in full support of the mission. We'll move on to, then, the first of the five strategic focus areas.

The first one is, we have a focus on strengthening the security of the domain name system and the DNS root server system.

Merike, will you take us through that.

MERIKE KAEO: Yes. Thank you for that, Maarten.

So, yes, with respect to security, the overall strategic objective, as Maarten just stated, was to strengthen the security of the DNS, the domain name system, and the DNS root server system. There are four specific strategic goals associated with that. The first one being able to strengthen the DNS coordination and partnership

with the DNS stakeholders to improve the shared responsibility of upholding the security and responsibility.

The second one speaks to governance and strengthening the DNS root server operations governance, obviously, in coordination with the DNS root server operations or operators, rather.

And then the third goal or -- was to understand and mitigate threats to the DNS through greater engagement with our cross-functional collaboration and engagement with DNS hardware, software, and service vendors. And the fourth strategic goal and security is to increase the robustness of the DNS root zone key signing and distribution services.

Now, overall, we had 18 comments that were received. Six were just comments of absolute support. Nine offered some edits in wording. And then there are three other suggestions that we would like to have more community input on. And when I talk about some of the edits, some of them were quite simplistic where it just suggested replace the word "Internet" with "DNS" and unique identifier systems. So most of those are very simple to accept.

But in terms of where we want some added community input, there were some comments that related to the governance of the DNS root server system. And one comment wanted to emphasize that accountable governance structure would discourage

alternate roots. Another comment also talked specifically about the wording of a risk, which offered and suggested to decouple the alternate root system from the deployment of DNSSEC.

Another comment also that we would like to have some community input on is about community engagement to understand and mitigate security threats. And I want to acknowledge the registry stakeholder comment to help with outreach and education.

So I'm wondering whether or not anybody has any comments at this point in time to offer.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much for being so happy with what we present here.

Please. Julie. If you can say your name, for the record.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer from SSAC.

Just to give a little bit of feedback, which is what I understand you're asking about, 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.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that comment, Julie.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's a very, very good remark. This is really -- at this level, the operational plan will be developed in close collaboration with the community as well and will be more detailed. So thanks for that.

The next strategic objective area is on ICANN's governance, improved effectiveness, and, as we saw, inclusiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance.

For this, Becky, could you take us through this one.

BECKY BURR: Yes, thank you.

There were 31 comments that related to -- specifically to the governance objectives. Some of the general comments also implicated this strategic goal as well. So these were kind of peppered throughout. Eight of the comments were essentially statements of support, some suggested edits, and 16 other suggestions.

Just to go through the goals, we had three of them listed here, addressing the increasing needs of inclusivity, accountability, and transparency while at the same time ensuring that work gets done and policies are developed in an inclusive and timely manner. Two is strengthen ICANN's multistakeholder decision-making process. And three is strengthen the inclusivity and openness of ICANN's multistakeholder model by improving and sustaining diverse representation and active effective participation.

So one comment -- and I think it was one -- but it did stop us in our tracks, is sort of what is the difference between goal 1, goal 2, and goal 3. And I think the conclusion when the Board discussed this is we do need to tighten these up. We're going to do that based on following the input that we get in the community session that Brian's going to lead on the evolution -- on Thursday because the governance issues raised are very closely tied with that.

Across the board, there was absolute support for ensuring that we preserve the bottom-up multistakeholder policy development process. And as Cherine said, that is the goal of this, is to preserve that.

And then the second aspect of that was what are the tradeoffs between sort of efficiency, effectiveness, inclusiveness, diversity,

consensus, and those kinds of things and how are you going to make the tradeoffs.

Some suggestions that we heard were making sure that we're thinking about resourcing as an important component of an effectiveness and efficiency, making sure that the resources are available and linking this to the -- to the budget obviously.

Some people pointed out -- and I think it's important -- that there are processes and procedures that can enhance the efficiency and effectiveness without sacrificing our core values but that there's some cultural issues, particularly a culture of cooperation and commitment to compromise and problem-solving that we need to address as part of this.

And then the other sort of tradeoff issue is, is this going to create additional pressures with respect to burnout? Can we be better at prioritizing and directing resources deliberately and thoughtfully to prevent burnout?

So those are the issues that -- the tradeoff issues are the issues that come to the top. And those are the issues that we think we need to know more about from the community.

Any questions or input on that? I mean --

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please.

BECKY BURR: One of the things about this is obviously this goal is very tied in with the work that Cherine was speaking about this morning and that we're going to do some more talking about on Thursday.

Go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the Internet service providers constituency. It's good to hear, if I understand correctly, that you are going in light of -- to -- let me say to rephrase a little bit, so it's goals in light of what you have been hearing from the community.

Looking for the time line 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. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: So thank you very much for that. That's very good input in terms of the timing and the organizational reviews and the amount of cycles that we spend on that. That is something obviously that we've been having a conversation with the community on and that are clearly part of the efficiency and using our resources wisely to enhance and support and refine the multistakeholder model.

We're not looking for reorganization or changing the bottom-up multistakeholder model. That is -- that will remain the basis for policy development.

What we're looking for is mechanisms to make that -- to make that better and more effective and more efficient.

But we take all of those things into consideration and we'll continue to do this as part of the conversation that we're going to have over the course of the year with the community.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alan Greenberg speaking on my own behalf.

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.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And you're absolutely right, and the Board is quite aware of this, which is why when Cherine asks here we have this five-year plan, are we going to have the skills and resources we need and the methodology we need to implement it. That's why we're sort of jump starting this conversation this year to focus on that.

But you're absolutely right, there are tradeoffs, and we really need to understand the implications of those tradeoffs and where we want to be as a community.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. And just noting that, indeed, in this title, it's not reflected but Cherine mentioned it earlier. It's not only the effectiveness but also the inclusiveness that we are aware is important.

Please, next.

ELSA SAADE: Hi, Elsa Saade. I'm on the GNSO Council representing NCSG, but I'm speaking here in my own personal capacity.

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.

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.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

BECKY BURR: You are absolutely correct, that being effectively inclusive requires us to have an environment in which people feel comfortable participating and they have the tools that they need to participate. So absolutely the anti-harassment work is a critical piece of that.

In terms of PDP 3.0, there is -- that work is critical. It's foundational. This is meant to support that work and not replace it in any way. So collaboration in terms of as the council understands how -- rolls PDP 3.0 out, we anticipate that there will be ways in which we can be supportive of that and then lessons learned and enhancements from that.

ELSA SAADE: Thank you very much.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Kavouss, please. Sorry, Cherine, can you respond to this one as well.

CHERINE CHALABY: I just want to support Becky in what she said but also say -- add it's not just about PDPs. This is looking at the efficiency and effectiveness of all of our governance.

So you heard, for example, this morning Alan Barrett on behalf of the RIRs saying their involvement with the ICANN model needs to be more effective and more simplified, nothing to do with PDPs and policies, GNSO policies.

So I just want to get this in our mind that we talk about the broader governance model and not just the policy development side. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Absolutely.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. And there's the ATRT as well with its own function, and this is not excluding that work.

BECKY BURR: Right. All of the reviews, et cetera.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Kavouss, the floor is yours.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good morning to all. I think there is a need for some slight amendment to this text and wording. 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.

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.

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. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And you're absolutely correct. Our goal is to increase efficiency while preserving and enhancing inclusivity and to increase efficiency and effectiveness while preserving the -- and enhancing the bottom-up multistakeholder methodology and also to do this while addressing burnout and volunteer fatigue. So you're absolutely correct on that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So thank you very much for this interaction, and I will now move towards the third strategic area, which is involvement of the unique identifier systems to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base. Tripti, can you take us through this?

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Maarten. So this particular strategic goal speaks to what is core to ICANN's mission and that is the management and coordination of the unique -- Internet's unique identifier systems. And as we know, the Internet continues to grow with more and more hosts in the form of people as well as devices, and at the same time, we live in a multilingual world and need to

accommodate just about all -- everyone who is on this global -- in this global community. And technologies continue to improve daily. So there are four subgoals that speak to this. The first one talks about encouraging readiness for the universal acceptance, IDN implementation and, of course, the deployment of IPv6 to continue to keep up with the growth of the Internet. And the second is to ensure that we have our finger on the pulse of evolving technologies, and the way we would do that is to stay engaged with academia, with industry, and other development standards. And the third says we should continue to deliver and enhance the IANA functions with operational excellence through IANA's affiliate PTI and, of course, to plan a properly funded and managed and risk-evaluated new next round of gTLDs.

So overall we received 26 comments, 2 which were strongly in support, 13 which were minor edits but certainly in support, and the remaining 11 were concerns in being more precise with our language, and we were indeed precise with our language, and some other suggestions.

We would like to receive some more input on three topics here which are, of course, this particular strategic goal and that would be the evolution of the new identifier systems that are percolating to ensure universal resolution as well as the support of IDNs and the continued deployment of IPv6. So we welcome more comments, and I open the floor for any other suggestions.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I see both names and numbers in the room and numbers is standing up right now. But Wolf-Ulrich was earlier so --

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the ISPc. 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.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much for your comment. And as you know, IDNs is a very complicated topic however, it is right on our radar. We

are working on it very closely, and we will continue to keep you informed. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please, John.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, president and CEO of ARIN, the American Registry of Internet Numbers, which is one of the five RIRs. 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.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much. We take that under advisement. Cherine, go ahead.

CHERINE CHALABY: John, thank you. And you probably -- I don't know if you were here this morning. I did mention specifically that collaboration with the RIRs on unique identifiers and other issues will be very important. And also to know that sometimes you guys take the

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Appreciate it. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maarten. Donna Austin from Neustar. 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.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you for your input. Clearly it's not clear whether there is a marketplace -- is there a marketplace or not or is it because there's a lack of awareness, therefore there isn't a marketplace. But we will -- thank you for the input. We will consider it.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So thank you. The gentleman on the right.

VIVEK GOYAL: Hi. My name is Vivek. I am the CEO of LdotR and speaking at a personal level here. 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.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. 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

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

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.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Kavouss, for articulating that problem, and we will certainly take that into -- and we're aware of it and we will consider it. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Gentleman on the right, please.

>>   My name is (saying name) from China. 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
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

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.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. You're making the point that was made earlier and you are correct. Adoption is not where it needs to be. It's far from being a -- permeating the ecosystem. And thank you for your suggestions on how to bring emails, IDN emails, into more day-to-day use. But we will look into the barriers for usage and permeation. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thank you very much for that. And thanks for the transcriber, one word they said the ICANN committee and we really talk about the ICANN community has to face this challenge. Cherine, would you like to add something on this?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. I want to go back to the comments made by Donna in terms of universal acceptance. And kind of I do agree with you that a campaign for awareness is quite important. I just want to share with you, you mentioned .SHABAKA. I was recently visiting Saudi Arabia, Dubai, the Emirates and Egypt, and I met with the ICT minister in each one of those countries. And guess what was on top of their agenda, all of them? IDNs and universal acceptance. And they are mounting a local, regional campaign to ensure consumer awareness in the region because for them this is very key. So your idea about a campaign and creating market demand through a campaign is something which is equitable to a lot of people. So thank you very much for bringing this up.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that. And you will note more activities in IDNs are going on this week as well. So with that, and in order to ensure our mission to -- of a single global interoperable Internet, we don't work in isolation. Hence the subject of addressing geopolitical issues. Leon, would you want to take us through that?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Maarten, thank you very much. Leon Sanchez. As Maarten has rightly put it, we do not work in isolation. We are part of an ecosystem, and that ecosystem has continuous changes and

we've seen how shifts in geopolitical interests have posed new challenges to our multistakeholder model.

So the strategic objective on geopolitics is to address this geopolitical issues impacting ICANN's mission to ensure a single globally interoperable Internet.

Through the public comment phase we received 16 comments, 8 of them in support, 1 suggested edit and 7 other suggestions. We received comments from different parts of our community include the ccNSO, the GNSO, the NCSG, the ALAC, and several individuals, as well as the BC. These comments range from support to this objective as our committee seems to be mindful of the importance of having ICANN continue to lead in this arena of Internet governance and geopolitical issues, and there also seems to be awareness that Internet governance is wider than the common concept that has been previously adopted by our community. So we're talking about impacts or actions that may impact our mission that come from actors that are not naturally or particularly seen to be participants of the Internet governance ecosystem.

So we have established two strategic goals on this end, which one of them is to further development early warning systems, such as ICANN org's (indiscernible) regulatory development reports to identify and address global needs and thrusts, demonstrating

ICANN's trustworthiness in resolving the challenges within its remit in a timely manner. An example of this is, of course, GDPR, as you might be aware. And to continue to build alliances in the Internet ecosystem and beyond to raise awareness and equip stakeholders from around the world to become active participants in ICANN's policy-making. To that end, you might have seen that organization recently (indiscernible) are chartered -- are charted to government-engaged approach. And this intends to set the guidelines under which organization will continue to engage with governments.

And I have received some comments from members of the community that see this charter maybe as limiting ICANN's emboldment, and giving the appearance of having ICANN giving a step back in the Internet governance arena. But I can assure you that it's all the contrary. ICANN and the board is aware that we need to recover and to foster this leading role in ICANN. And we would like to have more feedback, particularly on two questions.

First is in relation with the relationship with regional organizations, collaboration with country code registries. We are aware that many things don't start globally, start at a local level and then take global scale. So I -- we think that collaborating with local communities, principally with country code registries, is of the essence for this strategic objective.

And also, we want to get feedback on how to increase and to preserve the credibility and global acceptability of the multistakeholder model system.

So with that, I would like to open the floor for comments or questions.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hello. This is Lori Schulman from INTA. I'm speaking in my individual capacity.

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."

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Lori. That's very good input. And we will definitely consider adjusting the language.

Yes.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, Leon. My name is Barrack Otieno, from Africa Top Level Domains Organization.

I'm also a member of the ccNSO Strategic and Operations Planning Committee. And we have submitted some comments.

But specifically to the question that has been asked, first is to thank the team that has been involved in doing this great work.

And 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.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Barrack.

Definitely, we are aligned, I think, on the way we think about this issue. And remember, this is the first phase. We will go on on a next phase that will try to operationalize these strategic objectives into actions. And I'm pretty sure that we will continue to support these efforts and to create awareness through

different collaborations with local actors, as you have rightly put on the table. So thank you very much.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So thank you for that input. Well appreciated. And with that, we come to our -- Kavouss. Yes, please take the floor.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Perhaps some small suggestions.

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.

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. So these are the two small suggestions that I make.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Kavouss, well noted, and we'll incorporate that into our next iteration of the document. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Super. Appreciated.

So and nothing of this could happen without being able to finance it. And, actually, this topic came up after we considered the first four, realize be it's a crucial element.

So, Ron, would you be willing to take us to area five.

RON DA SILVA: Delighted to.

The fifth strategic objective, that was identified as ensuring ICANN's long-term financial sustainability. And there are three goals that have been enumerated to achieve that objective.

First, enhancing ICANN's understanding of the domain name marketplace.

Secondly, strengthening cost management and financial accountability mechanisms.

And lastly, enhancing ICANN's financial planning model to better balance economic changes and stakeholder needs.

We received 16 comments on these goals, six general support and ten broad concerns and other suggestions. But I think it's important to note, when it comes to finances, we have predominantly three levers to exercise. One, change the revenue, change the funding, make assumptions or alterations to how funding takes place.

Two, reduce what we do. Reduce our expenses, lower the amount of money that we're spending on a variety of programs and projects.

And three, maintaining those two things at equilibrium, prioritizing and managing the resources that we have at hand.

And no surprise, these comments kind of fell into these three general levers or three general categories, with a call towards continued increased transparency, continued accountability of what we're doing, why we're doing it, and making sure that there are regular prioritizations of initiatives and activities against the longer-range, broader objectives that are being articulated here in the overall strategic plan.

And then there was one extra that was added to the feedback here, and that is, we are undergoing and have just concluded the

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

first component of assessing a two-year financial or budgeting process. And there's another phase that's coming with some recommendations. But, basically, we're in a framing position of how -- what are the issues that would motivate us to get into a two-year model? And some of the feedback that came in through this is, is a two-year model the right direction to go. Would a more agile, monthly, quarterly, or some other periodicity make sense from a financial management standpoint? So that's good input that we'll definitely take into the overall two-year initiative that's being currently engaged parallel to this effort.

So I'll pause there and invite if there are additional comments or input into these goals, bring them forward now.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And also allowing questions on any of the previous ones at this point before we go to conclusions, summarizing what we've heard.

Roelof, are you approaching the mic?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, you're second. Please, gentleman on the right.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you. Vivek here again.

This may have been addressed, or if you're planning to address this again, I apologize. But my question is that it's very good we have strategic goals for five years. 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?

Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. A very good question.

So the strategic plan on its own is not executable. You need an implementation plan that shows you how you're going to execute it. And that's what we are currently beginning to work on, the operating and financial plan. And for every year of the strategic plan, this operating and financial plan would have a detailed road map of all the activities to implement these -- these objectives and these goals, the costs of them, the KPIs. And every year, we traditionally would put -- now we're going to do it on a two-year basis, apparently. But we put this out for the community so you

can see what are the activities for the year, what is the cost of them, how they relate to each strategic objective that we discussed, and what are the KPIs for success.

And then at the end of the year, we would measure and see whether we achieved those or not.

And it isn't just about activities, but it's also about the effectiveness of implementing this activity.

Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you. Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: My name is Roelof Meijer, from SIDN, the registry for .NL. Like Barrack and quite a few other people in the room, I am a member of the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Committee.

We have submitted our comments. We had a discussion with the ICANN team on that yesterday. So I think that explains at least our relative quietness. But I'm beginning to feel a bit uncomfortable about the silence in the room and the effort you are all making to get more input.

So 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.

My other comment, maybe we can go to the slide that has strategic objective 3 on it, just as an example. Is it possible or is it difficult?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's possible. We're there.

ROELOF MEIJER: Right.

I picked this comment because it covers most of the plan. 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.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Roelof, for that inspiration.

Please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin, Noncommercial Stakeholders Group. 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. As the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group, and I should say I'm speaking in my own capacity here because I may get tomatoes thrown at me tomorrow on constituency day,

but 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.

Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: Stephanie, thank you for that. Also Roelof.

To have smart roles, measurable, with exact time frames and how we're going to define success or not is going to be fleshed out more in the next stage of this process. This is the high-level strategic objectives and the associated goals with them, and then part of the operating plan and then the financial plan that will go with that will have the details you're looking for in a bit more measurable components. And I'm a huge fan, Stephanie, of having clearly defined KPIs and measuring against those or

reporting against those. That's the only way you can improve business efficacies.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: And the point that Roelof is making, which resonates a lot with me, he said all of these goals start with a verb indicating an activity but not an outcome. Is that what you're saying? And that we should really work hard at trying to -- I don't think it's possible in every one of those cases, but to make sure that the goal is stated as a real goal, as a target of doing something, an end as a product at the end of it or deliverable or position rather than just a beginning of an activity.

Is that what you're saying? Yeah. Yeah, we heard you. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Cherine.

Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is 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.

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.

AARTEN BOTTERMAN: Ron.

RON DA SILVA: Yeah, thank you for those comments, Marilyn.

The point was making is, you know, the main three levers that we have with financial control are related to revenue expense and then prioritization of what you have. And there wasn't any

particular feedback in this process advocating that there be specific or new revenue or product activities pursued to create new revenue. I was just trying to broadly characterize these are the areas where feedback kind of falls in. And actually, it's just the opposite. I think the broader concern with respect to revenue wasn't about increasing revenue. It was about declining revenues.

MARILYN CADE: And just to be clear -- Marilyn speaking -- 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.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. Understood.

Being cognizant of the time, we will close the line after John or if somebody is urgently jumping up right now.

So the line is closed after John.

Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN: This is Lori Schulman from INTA speaking in my personal capacity.

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.

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.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. Ron.

RON DA SILVA: Lori, it's great feedback. Thank you for that.

Certainly, on the latter point regarding management of the funds and the assets that the organization has, I think what you're asking is better planning and visibility into that. And that is what's, I think, integrated into the 5.3 strategic goal is ensuring that we have sustainability and proper management and transparency of the assets under management for the organization.

Back to the marketplace component, really to make sure that -- we're talking about a five-year window, a five-year planning

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

cycle, a five-year financial plan. Having a good understanding of what the risks are with respect to the marketplace, what the opportunities are, and how that could impact the overall economics is really what's contemplated in 5.1.

LORI SCHULMAN: Then I think I would actually say so. I think it's just too vague. I don't think that, as written, means very much.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Thank you for that. It is of our concern and we will take it into account. And it also will become increasingly important to the next phase of operational planning. So stay on board, please.

John.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, CEO ARIN, speaking solely on behalf of ARIN at this point.

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.

Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, John. I appreciate your warm words. I also appreciate, on behalf of the board, the expression of support and appreciation of the org support of this process which has been very well structured and very professionally brought forward in a very transparent way, I think.

So what we've heard today, for the sake of time, we won't summarize right now but we will reflect that in the public report that will come up.

Theresa, could you wrap up with sharing the next steps on this?

THERESA SWINEHART: Absolutely. And thank you, everybody. This has been very, very useful, and the comments have been very helpful.

So as far as the next steps go, between the period of now and April we're going to provide the summary of the public comments and get that posted to you, and work on incorporating the comments

received and finalizing the strategic plan, including obviously the feedback that we received from you here. So that's been very valuable. And then in the May to June time frame, the Board will consider the strategic plan and conditional adoption of the plan subject, of course, to any adjustments after the adoption of ICANN's five-year operating plan. The five-year operating plan is a costed-out plan, and so obviously any adjustments, we'd want to make sure that that could be -- that could be handled in that regard.

So those are the next steps moving forward, and we look forward, obviously, to the conversations that we're having here throughout the week with all of you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So thank you all very much for your engagement and your expressions of appreciation as well as your continuing remarks to help us to do this. This is a process we're doing together, and it's a great pleasure to see how well we get all focused on what the future is going to bring us next to the service we go through today to make things work well.

So appreciate it. The session is closed, and see you around.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]