From: improvements-c-bounces@atlarge-lists.icann.org [improvements-c-bounces@atlarge-lists.icann.org] On Behalf Of Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond [ocl@gih.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 26, 2010 6:48 PM To: improvements-c@atlarge-lists.icann.org Subject: [Improvements-C] Strategic Planning

Hello all,

since we are at an early stage in the work of this working team, I thought I'd throw a couple of ideas in the crucible for us to discuss. I'll admit, I have no clue of whether this is appropriate or not, so please, feedback/criticism greatly appreciated. Maybe I am completely misunderstanding what's being asked of us.

Strategic/Ops Plans

I have seen this being mentioned on many an occasion. Furthermore, without judging any prior ICANN "Strategic" Plan, I have had trouble finding the "strategy" element of plans elaborated so far, although the latest inceptions of such plans seem to contain improvements edging in the right direction.

Historically, strategy was a military thing. Sun Tzu and Clausevitz are two excellent models for that.

Sun Tzu's book has been ported to the Internet on many occasions - a text version is available here:

http://www.chinapage.com/sunzi-e.html

The Industrial Revolution brought new theories to light, with Strategy being applied in industry and commerce - and internal & external environmental analysis shone, examples of which are Porter's 5+1 analysis, PESTEL, BCG, SWOT, and other funky models. Finally, a recent type of strategy based on Resources, called RBV, for Resource Based View, was developed in the early eighties by Wernerfelt.

Usually, a Strategic Plan should include an internal analysis, as well as an external analysis. In the case of At Large, the external analysis should really be part of ICANN's overall strategy, and I would venture out to say that it is not our job to perform this, so I suggest we'll stick to the internal analysis.

An internal analysis hinges primarily on a SWOT model (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) - the name of which is self-explanatory. It is a pretty straight forward analysis, with the advantage that it can be done by involving the RALOs to look at themselves. Performing an RBV analysis (Resource Based View -

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Resource-based_view) is something which would be really interesting too, but I think that it is too premature at the moment. It would lead us to a strategic competencies analysis (as developed by Prahalad & Hamel in 1991) where we would have to identify the competencies of each ALS as well as each active member of At Large. This, in my view, is way too personal at the moment, and involves too much information. I have concerns whether this model is usable in a grass-roots bottom-up driven process. Indeed, perhaps is this model redundant in such an environment?

For the time being, I therefore suggest:

a. performing a SWOT analysis on At Large;

In order to avoid re-inventing the wheel, one was actually already done in the past. Some of your might remember the exercise:

 $\frac{https://st.icann.org/data/workspaces/alac/attachments/28 \ october \ 2007:20080309193645}{-1-975/original/Report%2520ALAC%2520Workshop%2520LA.pdf}$

Perhaps could we cut/paste this as a starting point, and update it accordingly?

b. we can then derive suggestions for recommendations based on the results of our SWOT;

c. to then extrapolate two scenarios (best case scenario and worst case scenario) for At Large's short term future, based on the results of our SWOT. We could even prioritise our action points required to avoid the worst case scenario.

This *might* provide us with more fire-power when designing our financial plans.

Has anything like this already been attempted, both in At Large, but also at RALO level?

Kind regards,

Olivier

--

Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond, PhD http://www.gih.com/ocl.html

Improvements-c mailing list
Improvements-c@atlarge-lists.icann.org
https://mm.icann.org/mailman/listinfo/improvements-c