



AL-ALAC-ST 0824-03-00-EN
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: [04 September 2024]
STATUS: [Status]

AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Draft ICANN Strategic Plan and draft - ICANN Operational Plan for
Fiscal Years 2026-2030

Preamble

On 23 July 2024” the Public Comment proceeding opened for the “Draft ICANN Strategic Plan and draft - ICANN Operational Plan for Fiscal Years 2026-2030” . An At-Large workspace was created in preparation for this Public Comment submission. The At-Large Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group (OFB-WG) reviewed the public comment and decided it would be in the interest of end users to develop and submit an ALAC Public Comment Statement.

Preamble.....1
Ratification Record.....2
ALAC and At-Large Community Comments..... 3

Ratification Record

On July 23, the Public Comment proceeding opened for the “Draft ICANN Strategic Plan and draft - ICANN Operational Plan for Fiscal Years 2026-2030. On 1 August Claire Craig, Judith Hellerstein, Vanda Scartezini ; Cheryl Langdon-Orr , Bukola Oronti ; Hadia Elminiawi volunteered to review the Public Comment. A small team of the pen holders met on 05,12,19 and 26 August. The pen holders discussed the comments for the ALAC statement during the August 15 OFB-WG call. The At-Large Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group (OFB-WG) decided it would be in the interest of end users to develop and submit an ALAC statement for this Public Comment proceeding. Penholders volunteered to draft the initial ALAC statement.

On August 15, the initial draft statement was shared with the OFB-WG for review and input. On September 04, the At-Large Public Comment Statement was finalized. The ALAC Chair, Jonathan Zuck, requested that the Public Comment Statement be ratified by the ALAC before submission to the ICANN Public Comment feature.

On [September 14th], staff confirmed the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the statement with [#] out of 15 votes in favor. [#] votes against, and [#] abstentions. Please note [100]% of ALAC members participated in the poll. The ALAC members who participated in the poll are (alphabetical order by first name): [Aziz Hilali, Bill Jouris, Bukola Oronti, Claire Craig, Eduardo Diaz, Joanna Kulesza, Jonathan Zuck, Justine Chew, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Marcelo Rodriguez, Pari Esfandiari, Raihanath Gbadamassi, Satish Babu, Shah Zahidur Rahman, and Tommi Karttaavi]. You may view the results here: [link to vote results]

ALAC and At-Large Community Comments

Executive Summary

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the At-Large Community appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft ICANN FY26-30 Strategic Plan and the Draft Operating Plan Framework. Our general response to this public comment shows our strong support for the new style and format of the Draft ICANN Strategic Plan and Operating Plan Framework for FY 26-30 documents. We especially appreciate the simplicity, clarity and visuals which contribute to a very positive overall experience.

We would like to also share the methodology we used to ensure active community engagement in this exercise. We created a community poll based on the ICANN's Public Comment standard form questions, supplemented with material edited from the draft documents and translated in three languages (English, France and Spanish). This approach was unique to this activity and aligns with the strategies outlined in the strategic plan to foster greater community involvement.

We received forty responses to the poll. The results are provided in two parts with answers to each question presented in the ICANN's Public Comment standard form, and verbatim excerpts of the [results](#) of our [At-Large Community Poll](#), presented in the general comments section.

Part A: Draft Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2026 - 2030

Section 1: Vision

1. How well does the vision statement align with your expectations or the needs of the community?

Very well

Somewhat well

Not well

Raw data and graphs from polling of At-Large Community Membership


EN total 31 Very Well = 27; Somewhat Well = 4; Not Well = 0

ES total 3 Very Well = 3; Somewhat Well = 0; Not Well = 0

FR total 6 Very Well = 4; Somewhat Well = 1; Not Well = 1

Aggregate: 40 Very Well = 34; Somewhat Well = 5; Not Well = 1

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

Two responses indicated that the alignment of the Vision Statement with the community's expectations and needs only 'Somewhat Well' and 'Not Well'. However, reasons given for this view included aspects that were seen to be either outside of ICANN's control or remit.

This title no longer corresponds to global reality. Proposed rewording: "As the trusted steward of the Internet's unique identification systems, ICANN is dedicated to strengthening a single, interoperable and resilient Internet that respects human rights and diversity on a global scale for all."

ICANN's role is to make the Internet safe and accessible to all without discrimination.

This vision statement could include the fact that ICANN is committed to using its multistakeholder process to achieve this end. We know that it is in the objectives but would be even more impactful if it was right there in the vision as there could be other models to achieve this end.

Section 2: Strategic Objectives as outlined in the FY26–30 Strategic Plan:

1. Are the strategic objectives clearly stated and easy to understand?

Yes

No


EN total 31 Yes = 30; No = 1

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 5; No = 1

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 38; No = 2

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

A welcomed consolidation of FY21-25 strategic objectives #1 and #2 (now presented as FY26-30 strategic objective #1), along with a more concise, and improved revision of the FY21-25 strategic objectives #3 to #5 (now presented as FY26-30 strategic objectives #2, #3 and #4, respectively).

We would rewrite the first point, adding "transparent". Thus: "Evolve and promote ICANN's Multistakeholder Model to sustain its inclusive and transparent Internet governance model." Reason: transparency is a real asset compared to the alternative models of governance.

Another comment on #1 Safeguard the evolving ICANN's bottom-up multi stakeholder approach to sustain its inclusive Internet governance model.

ICANN stakeholder model should take advantage of multiculturalism and be able to capitalize on ICANN's Ecosystem, which is a valuable asset as well as multistakeholderism.

Objective 2 must be better reformulated so that the goal is very precise and clear to understand

ICANN relies heavily on volunteers which could be recognized in #2

Be aware that to get success and contribute to fostering a more resilient, secure, interoperable, and unique Internet, comprehend the cultural differences, values, and beliefs is not only from the prism of our own culture but must also maintain an international strategic mindset to address a solid internet infrastructure

2. Do the strategic objectives adequately address the key issues and challenges facing ICANN?

(X) Yes

(_) No


EN total 31 Yes = 27; No = 4

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 5; No = 1

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 35; No = 5

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

A comment from a responder indicating 'no': Since the last strategic plan, the evolution of politics and technologies has changed the landscape considerably. Perhaps a more proactive goal focusing on: relevant stakeholders would be appropriate. This was specifically recognized previously and now has been merged out. The issue has not and will not go away.

Another respondent answering [NO] to this question proposed a rewording for Strategic Objective 1 to be: 'Safeguard *the evolving ICANN's bottom-up multistakeholder approach to sustain its inclusive Internet governance model.*'

A holistic review of ICANN is urgent and essential to evolve ICANN's structure and better respond to the challenges of the future for unique identifiers and their multi-actor governance.

There are concerns about the time taken to implement changes at ICANN, hence there is an expectation of more focused goals to quickly achieve the changes. May be illusory, but it is also relevant because of the expected outcome of the holistic reviews.

3. Are there any additional strategic objectives that need to be added, removed, or modified?

() Yes

() No


EN total 31 Yes = 11; No = 20

ES total 3 Yes = 0; No = 3

FR total 6 Yes = 4; No = 2

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 15; No = 25

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

Strategic Objectives need to be kept concise, yet sufficiently broad.

The 4 Strategic Objectives proposed work well for this purpose, except that Strategy Objection 4 should include mention of "stability", i.e. Strategic Objection 4: Strengthen the STABILITY AND Security of the Internet's Unique Identifier Systems."

While this may be a difficult topic, there still needs to be a reference to "the public interest" - perhaps as a contrast to the use of the term "vested interests". "public interest" or "public benefit". Something like this.

Align ICANN's governance frameworks with the Sustainable Development Goals.

Keeping in mind that the environmental sustainability goals should align with SDG, ICT sector carbon emissions are around 4% the equivalent of carbon emission aviation industry, hence we should raise awareness and ponder actions to mitigate the pollution of this sector such as measuring the carbon footprint of ICANN web pages, make business with sponsors whose data centres are transparency to release the amount of water and energy they use to run their data centres as well as use alternative or renewable energies, likewise, they tend to reuse the fresh water.

Section 3: Strategic Goals in the FY26–30 Strategic Plan

Goals and strategies are proposed for each of the 4 Strategic Objectives:

1. Are the strategic goals clearly defined and aligned with the strategic objectives?

Yes

No

EN total 31 Yes = 30; No = 1

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 4; No = 2

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 37; No = 3

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

"Inclusion" mentioned in SO 1 seems to have gotten lost in the three goals under it.

Item 1.3 needs to be strengthened by specifically articulating the need to "educate" and advocate. ICANN cannot perform its mandate if stakeholders, including end users, don't understand what ICANN does.

Need to change 1.3 to read "Expand Strategic Alliances to Educate & Advocate for the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance."

Note that "transparency" and "public interest" should be mentioned in the relevant sub-sections of the SO.

2. Is the breakdown of strategic objectives into strategic goals helpful to understand how the objectives will be achieved?

Yes

No

EN total 31 Yes = 30; No = 1

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 6; No = 0

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 39; No = 1

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None

3. Are there any strategic goals that need to be added, removed, or modified?

Yes

No


EN total 31 Yes = 9; No = 22

ES total 3 Yes = 0; No = 3

FR total 6 Yes = 1; No = 5

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 10; No = 30

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

2.3. Strengthen the recognition and understanding of ICANN's role globally

2.4 Implementing technological tools to enhance more meaningful participation by stakeholders such as tools that enable increased engagement and participation by stakeholders with limited bandwidth

3.1 Facilitate the optimization of accessibility of Digital Inclusion

Section 4: Strategies in the FY26–30 Strategic Plan Goals and strategies are proposed for each of the 4 Strategic Objectives; these in turn have several specific strategies:

1. Are the strategies provided for each strategic goal clear and actionable?

Yes

No

EN total 31 Yes = 31; No = 0

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 4; No = 2

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 38; No = 2

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

Developing a new generation of leaders is key. It also means making room for them to participate, learn, and be mentored into these new roles.

Strategies have to include resourcing and more multilayered use of experienced volunteers vis a vis new players.

2. Are the strategies appropriate and effective for achieving the strategic goals?

Yes

No

EN total 31 Yes = 29; No = 2

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 5; No = 1

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 37; No = 3

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

ICANN needs to identify and expand education with strategic educational partners. ICANN cannot be successful by trying to educate the world's stakeholders alone.

3. Are the progress indicators associated with each strategy adequate for tracking progress?

(X) Yes

(_) No


EN total 31 Yes = 27; No = 4

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 5; No = 1

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 35; No = 5

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

While the metrics associated with most strategies are implicit, there is no indication as to what exactly will be tracked. Worse, there is no indication as to what adequate progress might be relative to those metrics

Missing is a) support for the different constituents; b) the financial sustainability of ICANN - look not only at expenses but also at revenues.

4. Do the strategic risks identified for each strategy seem comprehensive and realistic?

Yes

No


EN total 31 Yes = 27; No = 4

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 4; No = 2

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 34; No = 6

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None


5. Do you have any suggestions for additional strategies, progress indicators, or improvements to the existing ones?

() Yes

() No

EN total 31 Yes = 10; No = 21
ES total 3 Yes = 1; No = 2
FR total 6 Yes = 1; No = 5
Aggregate:40 Yes = 12; No = 28

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

Identify and create MOUs with at least five international educational and library organizations to leverage non-ICANN brand channels.

Proposed additional 'Strategic Goals from the ALAC/At-Large, are shown in Green in the table(s) below. Associated additional 'Strategy' where appropriate, are shown in the following section.

Strategic Objective	Strategic Goals
<p>1: Evolve and promote ICANN's Multistakeholder Model to sustain its inclusive Internet governance model</p>	<p>1.1 Ensure Inclusive Stakeholder Representation and Integrated Collaboration</p> <p>1.2 Enhance the Agility and Effectiveness of Policy and Advice Development.</p> <p>1.3 Expand Strategic Alliances to Advocate for the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance.</p>
<p>2: Enhance organizational excellence.</p>	<p>2.1 Pursue a Sustainable Future.</p> <p>2.2 Enhance ICANN's Global Presence and Impact.</p> <p>2.3. Strengthen the recognition and understanding of ICANN's role globally</p> <p>2.4 Implementing technological tools to enhance more meaningful participation by all stakeholders</p>
<p>3: Collaborate with relevant stakeholders to evolve the Internet's unique identifier systems.</p>	<p>3.1 Facilitate the optimization of accessibility of Digital Inclusion/Facilitate digital inclusion (original)</p> <p>3.2 Evolve the Assessment of, and Responsiveness to, Technological Developments.</p> <p>3.3 Deliver and Enhance the IANA Functions to Meet Evolving Community Needs.</p>
<p>4: Strengthen the security of the Internet's unique identifier systems</p>	<p>4.1 Strengthen Partnerships with Relevant Stakeholders to Reinforce the Shared Responsibility of Ensuring Secure and Stable Internet's Unique Identifier Systems.</p> <p>4.2 Strengthen DNS Root Server Operations Governance.</p>

Part B: Draft Operating Plan Framework for Fiscal Years 2026 - 2030

Section 5: Operating Plan

1. Are the key activities outlined in the operating plan clearly defined and understandable?

Yes

No


EN total 31 Yes = 31; No = 0

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 6; No = 0

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 40; No = 0

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None

2. Do you agree with the phasing approach for each strategy?

Yes

No


EN total 31 Yes = 28; No = 3

ES total 3 Yes = 3; No = 0

FR total 6 Yes = 5; No = 1

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 36; No = 4

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None

3. Are any key activities too ambitious or unrealistic?

() Yes

() No


EN total 31 Yes = 3; No = 28

ES total 3 Yes = 0; No = 3

FR total 6 Yes = 4; No = 2

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 7; No = 33

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

The document effectively represents what must be implemented.

There is nothing like being too ambitious. If you do not aim high, you will never improve. ICANN should strive for the highest levels possible at all times and learn later why it might have not reached its goals on all levels.

Some activities are somewhat fuzzy in nature (eg., Build a new generation of leaders)...deep institutional knowledge is required for ICANN to operate, which means old leaders are still required.

ICANN has limited resources to educate external stakeholders on the importance of ICANN. There is a need to prioritize partnerships with international education and library organizations to leverage educational channels that already exist.

4. Are there any strategies that are not adequately addressed in the Operating Plan?

() Yes

() No


EN total 31 Yes = 8; No = 23

ES total 3 Yes = 0; No = 3

FR total 6 Yes = 3; No = 3

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 11; No = 29

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

These comments support the yes responses.

1.1.1 should include something on IMPLEMENTING any gaps identified as they appear.

1.1.5. should be orange instead of blue as more attention should be directed to this strategy

2.2 'Impact' methods and implementation strategies are not well addressed ... Needs expansion.

Additional ‘Strategy’ where appropriate, associated with any additional ‘Strategic Goals’ proposed, are shown in **Green** in the table below.

Strategic Objective	Strategic Goals	Strategy
<p>1. Evolve and promote ICANN’s Multistakeholder Model to sustain its inclusive Internet governance model.</p>	<p>1.1 Ensure Inclusive Stakeholder Representation and Integrated Collaboration.</p>	<p>1.1.1 Integrate new stakeholders into ICANN community groups as needed.</p> <p>1.1.2 Enable integrated collaboration among community groups.</p> <p>1.1.3 Foster an appealing environment for the next generation.</p> <p>1.1.4 Develop a new generation of leaders.</p> <p>1.1.5 Increase and broaden participation, particularly from underrepresented communities.</p>
	<p>1.2 Enhance the Agility and Effectiveness of Policy and Advice Development.</p>	<p>1.2.1 Reduce complexity and create incentives to encourage active participation.</p> <p>1.2.2 Establish a proactive framework to ensure early involvement and avoid unexpected outcomes.</p> <p>1.2.3 Proactively engage with governments, regulators, intergovernmental organizations, and other public policy stakeholders.</p> <p>1.2.4 Incorporate flexibility and agile methodologies into the policy and advice development and implementation life cycle.</p>

	<p>1.3 Expand Strategic Alliances to Advocate for the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance.</p>	<p>1.3.1 Demonstrate that ICANN’s multistakeholder model of governance remains the right model for delivering ICANN’s Mission</p> <p>1.3.2 Strengthen collaborative efforts to promote the multistakeholder model of Internet governance.</p>
<p>2. Enhance organizational excellence</p>	<p>2.1 Pursue a Sustainable Future.</p>	<p>2.1.1 Improve institutional agility and adaptability</p> <p>2.1.2 Preserve ICANN’s financial sustainability</p>
	<p>2.2 Enhance ICANN’s Global Presence and Impact.</p>	<p>2.2.1 Evolve the hybrid workforce model and optimize regional office utilization.</p> <p>2.2.2 Embed ecological responsibility into ICANN’s operations</p>
	<p>2.3 Strengthen the recognition and understanding of ICANN’s role globally</p>	<p>2.3.1 Considering geopolitical risks, concentrate communications efforts on such regional efforts at the time.</p> <p>2.3.2 Define the communications approach considering the regional focus, including ICANN’s Regional Engagement Teams</p>
	<p>2.4 Implementing technological tools to enhance more meaningful participation by stakeholders</p>	<p>2.4.1 Enhance meaningful participation by stakeholders and ensure that the tools enable increased engagement and participation taking into consideration Universal Design in the tool’s design and choice</p>

<p>3. Collaborate with relevant stakeholders to evolve the Internet’s unique identifier systems</p>	<p>3.1 Facilitate Digital Inclusion.</p>	<p>3.1.1 Promote the advancement of Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names.</p> <p>3.1.2 Proactively collaborate with all the relevant external parties to promote Universal Acceptance.</p> <p>3.1.3 Cultivate consumer choice, competition, inclusivity, and innovation.</p>
	<p>3.2 Evolve the Assessment of, and Responsiveness to, Technological Developments.</p>	<p>3.2.1 Evolve ICANN’s understanding of the identifier systems landscape, and adapt as needed.</p> <p>3.2.2 Collaborate with technical community entities, such as the Internet Engineering Task Force, Regional Internet Registries, and root server operators, to understand new technologies.</p>
	<p>3.3 Deliver and Enhance the IANA Functions to Meet Evolving Community Needs.</p>	<p>3.3.1 Continue to reliably deliver the IANA functions.</p> <p>3.3.2 Ensure that the IANA functions are properly resourced.</p>
<p>4. Strengthen the security of the Internet’s unique identifier systems</p>	<p>4.1 Strengthen Partnerships with Relevant Stakeholders to Reinforce the Shared Responsibility of Ensuring Secure and Stable Internet’s Unique Identifier Systems.</p>	<p>4.1.1 Continue to provide and participate in trusted forums that convene relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>4.1.2 Identify and mitigate security threats to the Internet’s unique identifier systems.</p> <p>4.1.3 Increase ICANN’s coordination and collaboration with the numbers community for secure, stable, and resilient numbering and routing systems.</p>

	4.2 Strengthen DNS Root Server Operations Governance.	4.2.1 Continue to enhance the governance and technical evolution of the DNS root server operations and services. 4.2.2 Increase the robustness of the root zone generation, distribution services, and processes. 4.2.3 Support coordinated plans to address DNS Root Server System attacks.
--	--	---

5. Are there any overlaps or redundancies in the proposed key activities that could be streamlined?

() Yes

() No


EN total 31 Yes = 1; No = 30

ES total 3 Yes = 0; No = 3

FR total 6 Yes = 1; No = 5

Aggregate: 40 Yes = 2; No = 38

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None

Part C: Other General Comments

Section 6: Other Comments

1. Overall, how satisfied are you with the draft Strategic Plan?

Very Satisfied

Satisfied

Neutral

Unsatisfied

Very Unsatisfied


EN total 31 Very Satisfied = 9, Satisfied = 19, Neutral = 3.

ES total 3 Very Satisfied = 1, Satisfied = 2

FR total 6 Very Satisfied = 1, Satisfied = 5

Aggregate 40 Very Satisfied 11, Satisfied = 26, Neutral = 3

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None

2. Overall, how satisfied are you with the draft Operating Plan?

Very Satisfied

Satisfied

Neutral

Unsatisfied

Very Unsatisfied


EN total 31 Very Satisfied = 8, Satisfied = 19, Neutral = 4

ES total 3 Very Satisfied = 1, Satisfied = 2

FR total 6 Very Satisfied = 2, Satisfied = 2, Neutral = 2

Aggregate 40 Very Satisfied 11, Satisfied = 23, Neutral = 6

Pie Chart of Polling Results



Comments:

None

3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for improving the Strategic Plan or Operating Plan?

There is a real concern about ICANN's future and mission. There needs to be something mentioned about "ICANN's evolution". This can be a contentious topic, but is ICANN's mission static? Its broad mission is about "the Internet's identifiers", yet in practice there are many stakeholders who want it restricted to "domain names" and to a lesser extent, "IP addresses and protocol parameters - through the IANA functions" and that's it. Does this mean that if domain names as we know them today decrease in significance, ICANN's own significance will decrease too?

4. Other General Comments

This section is still subject to additional review of our [At-Large Community Poll results](#), which assist in formulating non-substantial edits before any call for ratification by the ALAC.

Additional General Comments

The responses presented in this section of the Public Comment represents verbatim excerpts from the [results](#) of our [At-Large Community Poll](#).

1. How well does the vision statement align with your expectations or the needs of the community?

(X) Very well

(_) No

Comments from the Poll:

(9 responses). 'As the trusted steward of the Internet's unique identifier systems, ICANN is dedicated to strengthening the single, globally interoperable and safe Internet for all'

The additions of "trusted steward", "dedication to the single, globally interoperable Internet for all" are appropriate and very important.

I would say "supporting and strengthening" - because just keeping "strengthening" might be interpreted like the current system requires changes, when in fact, the current unique identifier system is fit for purpose.

Revise the statement to "..ICANN is committed to strengthening the security of the single..."

The revision of the strategic plan and its enforcement to action is a great step to the future, but Awareness and DNS maturity in Nepal especially is relatively low.

As long as the ICANN Board promotes and abides by the bottom-up approach in relating with all the internet end users.

And also amplifying their voices within the ICANN ECOSYSTEM.

This vision statement could include the fact that ICANN is committed to using its multistakeholder process to achieve this end. I know that is in the objectives but would be even more impactful if it was right there in the vision as there could be other models to achieve this end.

(4 responses)

Ce titre ne correspond plus à la réalité mondiale

Reformulation proposée : "En tant qu'intendant digne de confiance des systèmes d'identification uniques d'Internet, l'ICANN se consacre au renforcement d'un Internet unique, interopérable et résilient, respectueux des droits humains et de la diversité à l'échelle mondiale pour **tous**".

Le rôle de ICANN est de rendre l'internet sûr et accessible a tous sans discrimination.

RAS

EN version: This title no longer corresponds to global reality

Proposed Rewording: "As the trusted steward of the Internet's unique identification systems, ICANN is dedicated to strengthening a single, interoperable and resilient Internet that respects human rights and diversity. on a global scale for all.

ICANN's role is to make the Internet safe and accessible to all without discrimination.

Section 2: Strategic Objectives

1. Are the strategic objectives clearly stated and easy to understand?

(X) Yes

(_) No

Comments from the Poll:

(9 responses) Note of support for Sec 2, 1a:

A welcomed consolidation of FY21-25 strategic objectives #1 and #2 (now presented as FY26-30 strategic objective #1), along with a more concise, and improved revision of the FY21-25 strategic objectives #3 to #5 (now presented as FY26-30 strategic objectives #2, #3 and #4, respectively).

With one exception: Strategic Objective 4.

I would re-write the first point, adding "transparent". Thus: "Evolve and promote ICANN's Multistakeholder Model to sustain its inclusive and transparent Internet governance model."

Reason: transparency is a real asset compared to the alternative models of governance.

No doubt that all these points are being very well developed

Strategic 4(1) above should/is what makes ICANN what it is today if this approach can be strengthened and non-technical stakeholders in ICANN are heard and given greater opportunities of engagement within ICANN

1. It's essential to ensure that the multistakeholder model actively incorporates the perspectives of Persons With Disabilities (PWDs). It should focus on creating accessible platforms and ensuring that PWD can participate meaningfully in ICANN governance processes.

2. Organizational excellence should include a commitment to accessibility in all aspects of ICANN's operations, from its communication methods to its event planning and stakeholder engagement. Excellence should be defined by how well ICANN serves all stakeholders, including those with disabilities.

3. Collaboration should include partnerships with organizations and experts in accessibility to ensure that the evolution of the Internet's unique identifier systems (like domain names and IP addresses) considers the needs of PwD. For example, ensuring that these systems are navigable and understandable for all users, including those with visual, auditory, or cognitive disabilities.

4. Security measures should be designed with an awareness of accessibility needs. This includes ensuring that security protocols do not inadvertently create barriers for PwD, such as overly complex CAPTCHA systems that are difficult for some individuals to navigate.

ICANN's model is unique. This could be noted in #1

This organization relies heavily on volunteers which could be recognized in #2

Number one should be: Safeguard the evolving ICANN's bottom-up multistakeholder approach to sustain its inclusive Internet governance model.

Strategic 1: ICANN stakeholder model we should take advantage of the multiculturalism we can feel on the ICANN Ecosystem, which is a valuable asset as well as the multistakeholderism.

Nevertheless, at the same time be aware that to get success and contribute to fostering a more resilient, secure, interoperable, and unique Internet, comprehend the cultural differences, values, and beliefs not only from the prism of our own culture but maintain an international strategic mindset to address a solid internet infrastructure

(1 response) Cuales son las partes interesadas relevantes? / *EN version: Who are the relevant stakeholders?*

(4 responses) *Reformulation : OS 3 - Collaborer avec les parties prenantes concernées et soutenir la R&D et l'innovation pour faire évoluer les systèmes d'identification uniques d'Internet.*

OS 4 : Renforcer la sécurité et la résilience des systèmes d'identification unique d'Internet.

1 - Continuer à faire évoluer le modèle multi-parties prenantes de l'ICANN pour soutenir et promouvoir une gouvernance de l'Internet inclusif.

3 : Collaborer avec les parties prenantes concernées (interne et externe à l'ICANN) pour faire évoluer les systèmes d'identification uniques d'Internet.

5 - Assurer une pérennité financière de l'ICANN

Les piliers les plus importants sont pris en compte dans les objectifs stratégiques énumérés.

L'objectif 2 doit être mieux reformulé pour que le but soit bien précis et claire à comprendre / EN version: Restatement: SO 3 - Collaborate with relevant stakeholders and support R&D and innovation to evolve the Internet's unique identification systems.

ES 4: Strengthen the security and resilience of Internet unique identification systems.

1 - Continue to evolve ICANN's multi-stakeholder model to support and promote inclusive Internet governance.

3: Collaborate with relevant stakeholders (internal and external to ICANN) to evolve the Internet's unique identification systems.

5 - Ensure the financial sustainability of ICANN

The most important pillars are taken into account in the listed strategic objectives.

Objective 2 must be better reformulated so that the goal is very precise and clear to understand

2. Do the strategic objectives adequately address the key issues and challenges facing ICANN?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(8 responses) *El modelo de múltiples partes interesadas ya no se cuestiona, sino la forma de implementarlo, donde los mecanismos participativos están fracasando y donde las reuniones pierden efectividad, pierden audiencia y concurrencia y donde poco a poco se van convirtiendo en lobby de unos muy pocos mientras los costos ascienden. / EN version: The multi-stakeholder model is no longer questioned, but rather the way of implementing it, where participatory mechanisms are failing and where meetings are losing effectiveness, losing audience and attendance and where little by little they are becoming a lobby for a very few while the costs rise.*

At a high level, the 4 Strategic Objectives proposed work well, with one exception: Strategic Objective 4.

yes. ICANN is doing a great job at performing the functions it needs to perform. In particular, striving to continue improving its processes is a valid and required goal.

While addressing these issues, they also do not adequately track how to maintain volunteer efforts and the time they put in. Also what technology tools can be used? Using newer tech tools can help engage participation but when these are limited it makes it harder. This is especially true when focusing on the impacts on current constituencies with cuts to the budget.

The objectives adequately address the biggest responsibility that the ICANN needs to develop. Since the last strategic plan, the evolution of politics and technologies have changed the landscape considerably. Perhaps a more proactive goal re: relevant stakeholders would be appropriate. This was specifically recognized previously and now has been merged out. The issue has not and will not go away.

This is a positive step towards sustainability and is promising, but it does not go far enough in addressing the core issues at hand. (1)As a public benefit organization, ICANN should take a leadership role by explicitly redefining its concept of public benefit to include ecological responsibility.

(2)ICANN is primarily a governance body, and as such, it should focus on areas where it can have the greatest impact __the efficiency and environmental impact of the internet infrastructure itself.

(4 responses) Améliorer la gestion des dépenses de fonctionnement interne

Une revue holistique de l'ICANN est urgente et indispensable pour faire évoluer la structure de l'ICANN et mieux répondre aux défis du futur pour les identifiants uniques et leur gouvernance multi-acteurs.

La pérennité financière de l'ICANN (et pas seulement baisser les coûts liés aux fonctionnement multi-acteurs) est importante.

C'est exactement le cas à mon avis.

RAS / EN version: Improve the management of internal operating expenses

A holistic review of ICANN is urgent and essential to evolve ICANN's structure and better respond to the challenges of the future for unique identifiers and their multi-actor governance.

The financial sustainability of ICANN (and not just reducing the costs linked to multi-stakeholder operations) is important.

This is exactly the case in my opinion.

3. Are there any additional strategic objectives that need to be added, removed, or modified?

() Yes

() No

Comments from the Poll:

(10 responses) 4. Strengthen the security and stability of the Internet's unique identifier systems

Buscar lograr economías en TODA la organización de ICANN para apoyar de mejor manera el modelo de múltiples partes interesada y no sólo el ahorrar en la organizaciones de las reuniones sino aumentar el subsidio de las mismas y mejorar los aspectos participativos

Strategic Objectives need to be kept concise, yet sufficiently broad.

The 4 Strategic Objectives proposed work well for this purpose, except that Strategy Objection 4 should include mention of "stability", i.e. Strategic Objection 4: Strengthen the STABILITY AND Security of the Internet's Unique Identifier Systems." (emphasis mine)

I know it is a difficult topic and we've been going in circles about this, but there still definitely needs to be a reference to "the public interest" - perhaps as a contrast to the use of the term "vested interests". "public interest" or "public benefit". Something like this.

Explanation: in At-Large, as end users, we need to defend the interests of the end users. That's the public interest. The interest of the public; of people worldwide.

1. Foster Innovation: Encourage and support technological advancements and innovations that can enhance the Internet's infrastructure and services
2. Enhance User Privacy and Data Protection: Develop and implement policies that protect user privacy and ensure data security across the Internet.

3. Improve Transparency and Accountability: Increase transparency in decision-making processes and hold all stakeholders accountable to maintain trust and integrity.

4. Support Environmental Sustainability: Implement practices and policies that reduce the environmental impact of Internet infrastructure and operations.

The a need to lower the bar in increasing the number of languages to be adopted for the UA.

Modified Objective 2: Enhance organizational excellence by embedding accessibility into all aspects of ICANN's operations, from internal policies to external communications and stakeholder engagement.

Rationale: This modification ensures that accessibility is considered a key component of what it means to be an excellent organization, thus embedding it into the core of ICANN's operational strategy.

see comments above

New Objective: Align ICANN's governance frameworks with the Sustainable Development Goals.

Keep in mind the environmental sustainability goals align to the SDGs , ICT sector carbon emissions are around 4% the equivalent of carbon emission aviation industry, hence we should raise awareness and ponder actions to mitigate the pollution of this sector such as measuring the carbon footprint of ICANN web pages, make business with sponsors whose datacentres are transparency to

release the amount of water and energy they use to run their datacentres as well as use alternative or renewable energies, likewise, they tend to reuse the fresh water.

(4 responses) Mieux accompagner les pays où l'industrie internet des domaines est peu structuré et prévenir les prédatons de pays riches

Voir réponse précédente

Je suis en phase avec ces déclarations d'objectifs stratégiques.

RAS / EN version: Better support countries where the internet domain industry is poorly structured and prevent predations from rich countries

See the previous answer

I am aligned with these statements of strategic objectives.

Section 3: Proposed Additional Strategic Goals

1. Are the strategic goals clearly defined and aligned with the strategic objectives?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(11 responses) "Inclusion" mentioned in SO 1 seems to have gotten lost in the three goals under it. Item 1.3 needs to be strengthened by specifically articulating the need to "educate" and advocate. ICANN cannot perform its mandate if stakeholders, including end users, don't understand what ICANN does. Need to change 1.3 to read "Expand Strategic Alliances to Educate & Advocate for the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance."

Sec 3, 1a: Generally yes.

Note the two points I made about (1) transparency and (2) the public interest. These should be mentioned in the relevant sub-sections of the above.

In 1.1 we should use more human captioning to ensure we are meeting all the needs. AI captioning fails in reaching certain groups. Also the lack of a separate stream text link disadvantages persons who with hearing disabilities as they often rely on the stream text link to better follow and engage with the conversation. Also, separate links help many whose bandwidth issues prevent them from being fully engaged as they may miss important sections since they drop a stream. With a separate text stream this does not happen

I believe it is pretty clear and understandable.

The strategic goals are generally aligned, but the following should be considered:

1. Ensure Inclusive Stakeholder Representation and Integrated Collaboration, is critical for PwD as it emphasizes inclusive representation. However, it should explicitly mention accessibility to ensure that PwD are not just included in theory but can participate fully in practice. For instance, ensuring that meetings, documents, and platforms are accessible.

2. Strategic alliances should include partnerships with organizations that advocate for digital accessibility and the rights of persons with disabilities. This would ensure that the multistakeholder model considers the needs of PwD.

3. Enhancing global presence and impact should include ensuring that ICANN's outreach and engagement efforts are accessible to PwD worldwide. This includes making events, communications, and resources available in accessible formats and languages, and reaching out to communities that advocate for PwD.

1.1 Ensure Inclusive stakeholder representation with adequate resources to enable full participation and integrated collaboration.

Foster an appealing environment for all generations. It is important to bring in new leaders but they will be relying on experienced volunteers for some time as they develop expertise. Develop a strategy to recognize the thousands of volunteer hours that keep ICANN's MSM model alive. This may be key to retaining new recruits.

Suggested changes:

1.1 Ensure Inclusive Stakeholder Representation and Integrated Collaboration with a focus on bottom-up participation.

1.2 Enhance the Agility and Effectiveness of Policy and Advice Development, incorporating SDGs into the decision-making process.

What does ICANN mean by a sustainable future? This includes each of the SDG and digitalization future.

Enhance the newcomers, NextGen participants as well as fellows' experiences and let them more involved in stakeholder groups and give them the chance to release papers, articles, and research

(5 responses) intégrée et durable ; 2.1 Poursuivre un avenir durable et résilient.

2.2 Renforcer la présence et l'impact mondiaux de l'ICANN ; 3.2 Faire évoluer l'évaluation, la proactivité et la réactivité face aux avancées technologiques ; 3.3 Renforcer et améliorer les fonctions IANA pour répondre aux besoins changeants et évolutifs de la communauté ; 4.1 Etablir et renforcer des partenariats solides avec les parties prenantes concernées pour une responsabilité partagée en matière de sécurité et de stabilité des systèmes d'identification uniques d'Internet
1.1 bis Revue Holistique de l'ICANN (est urgente)

2.2 Améliorer la présence et l'impact [au niveau mondial] ((mondiaux))de l'ICANN.

2.3 Améliorer et renforcer les services de ICANN à ses constituantes

4.2 Renforcer la gouvernance des opérations du serveur racine DNS.

? des serveurs (13) racines ?

C'est le cas effectivement.

Je propose pour Objectif 2.1 : Définir une vision à long terme / *EN version: integrated and sustainable; 2.1 Pursue a sustainable and resilient future.*

2.2 Strengthen ICANN's global presence and impact; 3.2 Develop evaluation, proactivity and reactivity to technological advances; 3.3 Strengthen and improve IANA functions to meet the changing and evolving needs of the community; 4.1 Establish and strengthen strong partnerships with relevant stakeholders for shared responsibility for the security and stability of Internet unique identification systems

1.1 bis ICANN Holistic Review (urgent)

2.2 Enhance ICANN's presence and impact.

2.3 Improve and strengthen ICANN services to its constituents

4.2 Strengthen governance of DNS root server operations.

? (13) root servers?

This is indeed the case.

I propose for Objective 2.1: Define a long-term vision

2. Is the breakdown of strategic objectives into strategic goals helpful to understand how the objectives will be achieved?

(X) Yes

(_) No

Comments from the Poll:

(4 responses) They are. The only risk with listing sub-sections under the main sections is that these might be seen as further focusing on the main points, thus risking excluding other points that might otherwise be included without the sub-headings.

So perhaps - adding "in particular" so as not to reduce the scope of the main headings.

I am assuming a sustainable future includes environmental impact and data privacy concerns that are taken care of

I make it easy for effective practice.

(3 responses) On se croirait à l'ONU, si on peut résumer en max 3 à 5 points majeurs ce serait parfait!

Oui effectivement.

RAS / *EN version: It's like being at the UN, if we can summarize in max 3 to 5 major points that would be perfect!*

Yes indeed.

3. Are there any strategic goals that need to be added, removed, or modified?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(9 responses) Something about a multilingual Internet that would enhance inclusion could be added.

As written above, statement 1.3 needs to specifically state it is a strategic objective for ICANN to educate outside stakeholders. ICANN cannot meet its mandate if end-user stakeholders don't understand what ICANN does.

2.3. Strengthen the recognition and understanding of ICANN's role globally

2.4 Implementing technological tools to enhance more meaningful participation by stakeholders such as tools that enable increased engagement and participation by stakeholders with limited bandwidth

3.1 Facilitate the optimization of accessibility of Digital Inclusion

Mejorar y ampliar los mecanismos que den participación a las comunidades

Goal 1.1 should be modified to include not just inclusivity, but also BALANCE. (For example, currently, every stakeholder group has 2 members on the ICANN Board -- except ALAC. This would seem to conflict with the Multistakeholder model.)

Goal 2.1 These days, "sustainability" generally refers to issues of environmental impact, i.e. resources, energy usage, etc. I.e. something like the Green Internet discussions in 2.2. Perhaps this could be modified to say "Financial Sustainability".

I like the two-pronged approach: (1) enhance the organization and its functions and (2) collaborate with others in the wider Internet ecosystem.

The goals, once defined cannot be changed easily, differently to strategies.

Following are the Suggested Modifications:

Goal 1.1: Ensure Inclusive and accessible Stakeholder Representation and Integrated Collaboration.

Rationale: By explicitly mentioning "accessible," this goal emphasizes the importance of not only including diverse stakeholders but also ensuring that all collaboration tools, platforms, and processes are accessible to PwD.

Goal 2.1: Pursue an accessible and Sustainable Future.

Rationale: Sustainability should include accessibility as a core component, ensuring that all future operations, strategies, and developments are accessible to PwD.

Goal 3.1: Facilitate Digital Inclusion and accessibility.

Rationale: Adding "accessibility" ensures that digital inclusion efforts are not just about connecting more people to the Internet but also about making sure that these connections and the associated systems are usable by PwD.

Goal 4.1: Strengthen Partnerships with Relevant Stakeholders to Reinforce the Shared Responsibility of Ensuring Secure, Stable, and Accessible Internet Unique Identifier Systems.

Rationale: Security measures must be accessible to all users, including PwD. This modification ensures that security is designed with accessibility in mind.

see various comments above

(4 responses) il faut réduire le nombre de items

Voir précédentes réponses

Pour moi, c'est bon comme ça.

RAS / EN version: the number of items must be reduced

See previous answers

For me, it's good like that.

Section 4: Strategies

1. Are the strategies provided for each strategic goal clear and actionable?

(X) Yes

(_) No

Comments from the Poll:

(4 responses)

Developing a new generation of leaders is key. It also means making room for them to participate, learn, and be mentored into these new roles.

Strategies have to include resourcing and more multilayered use of experienced volunteers vis a vis new players.

The organization relies on a large volunteer workforce but has minimal strategies to motivate this workforce and keep them involved. Attracting these people is only one part of the equation. / EN version: 1.2.1 Reduce complexity and create incentives to encourage active participation. => we have structural imbalances linked to initial inequities, "first catch all the benefits" which favors the North American continent, Europe and Australia.

Reformulations: 1.1.2 Enable integrated and sustainable collaboration between community groups; 1.1.4 Train and develop a new generation of leaders; 1.1.5 Increase and diversify participation, particularly that of underrepresented communities; 1.2.1 Simplify procedures and create incentives to encourage active participation; 1.2.2 Establish a proactive framework to ensure early participation and minimize unexpected outcomes; 1.3.1 Demonstrating the value and effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder governance model remains the right model to achieve ICANN's mission; 1.3.2 Strengthen strategic partnerships and collaborations to promote the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance

1.1. Holistic Review of ICANN is essential to achieve this Objective 1 (and urgent)
1.3.2 Strengthen collaborative efforts to promote ((the multi-stakeholder model)) [THE multi-stakeholder models] of Internet governance.

Everything is clear and achievable in my opinion.

(5 responses) 1.2.1 Réduire la complexité et créer des incitations pour encourager la participation active. => on a des déséquilibre structurels lié aux iniquités de départ, "first catch all the benefits" qui favorise le continent nord américain, l'Europe et l'Australie.

Reformulations : 1.1.2 Permettre une collaboration intégrée et durable entre les groupes communautaires ; 1.1.4 Former et développer une nouvelle génération de leaders ; 1.1.5 Accroître et diversifier la participation, en particulier celle des communautés sous-représentées ; 1.2.1 Simplifier les procédures et créer des incitations pour encourager la participation active ; 1.2.2 Etablir un cadre proactif pour garantir une participation précoce et minimiser les résultats inattendus ; 1.3.1 Démontrer la valeur et l'efficacité du modèle de gouvernance multipartite de l'ICANN reste le bon modèle pour réaliser la mission de l'ICANN ; 1.3.2 Renforcer les partenariats stratégiques et les collaborations pour promouvoir le modèle multipartite de gouvernance de l'Internet

1.1.x Revue holistique de l'ICANN est indispensable pour réaliser cet Objectif 1 (et urgente)
1.3.2 Renforcer les efforts de collaboration pour promouvoir ((le modèle multipartite)) [LES modèles multi-parties prenantes] de gouvernance de l'Internet.

Tout est clair et réalisable a mon avis.

2. Are the strategies appropriate and effective for achieving the strategic goals?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(7 responses) We need to identify and expand education with strategic educational partners. ICANN cannot be successful by trying to educate the world stakeholders alone.

Sec 4, 2a: Yes, to a point.

xx

More emphasis on how to reach out to different communities, such as sign language more emphasis on human captioning and also more language options. Also see my comments on the importance of a separate stream text link

Term limits for leadership positions to allow fresh ideas

Meetings and small group discussions can determine the actions

see comment above

(4 responses) en grande partie ;

Il manque

a) le soutien aux différentes constituantes

b) la pérennité financière de l'ICANN - ne pas se pencher seulement sur les dépenses mais aussi sur les revenus

Oui effectivement, les stratégies sont appropriées et efficaces pour atteindre les objectifs stratégiques.

.

3. Are the progress indicators associated with each strategy adequate for tracking progress?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(5 responses) While the metrics associate with most strategies are implicit, there is no indication as to what exactly will be tracked. Worse, there is no indication as to what adequate progress might be relative to those metrics

See my answer to Sec 4, 5b.

xx

A benchmark or a quantitative KPI must be provided for each consideration
However, all these points are important; no one has a specific action for an effective action.

(4 responses) RAS

Il en manque - voir réponses précédentes
Oui effectivement

4. Do the strategic risks identified for each strategy seem comprehensive and realistic?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(3 responses) I am not seeing anything related to strategic risks here
Not clear about strategy risks.

(4 responses) Principes généraux et peu réaliste, les dénonciations à longueur de forum ne changent rien

Risques organisationnel et financier manquent

Je le pense aussi.

*RAS / EN version: General principles and unrealistic, forum-length denunciations change nothing
Organizational and financial risks are missing
I think so too.*

5. Do you have any suggestions for additional strategies, progress indicators, or improvements to the existing ones?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(9 responses) Identify and create MOUs with at least five international educational and library organizations to leverage non-ICANN brand channels.

Add metrics for evaluating progress towards each goal

1/ Strategy 1.1.1, strategy implementation for continuous improvement (i.e. 2nd bullet) needs to include the Nominating Committee (NomCom)

2/ Strategy 1.1.1, strategy implementation for stakeholder representation (i.e. 4th bullet) should address not only gaps but also imbalance, in stakeholder representation.

3/ Strategy 1.1.2, strategy implementation for enabling integrated collaboration among community groups could include ways to facilitate (more) intersessional, formal/informal conversations.

4/ Strategy 1.1.3, strategy implementation for fostering an appealing environment (i.e. 1st bullet) would also benefit from feedback from some existing volunteers, SOAC members in respect of appropriate platforms.

5/ Strategy 1.1.4, is it possible to link this strategy to strongly encourage continuous improvement somehow?

6/ Strategy 1.1.5 should include "effective" i.e. 1.1.5 Increase and broaden EFFECTIVE participation, particularly from underrepresented communities. (emphasis mine, then we can all work on what "effective" means).

7/ Strategy 1.2.1 should mention "consensus building" up front (and not just in strategy implementation within the 1st bullet); i.e. 1.2.1 Reduce complexity and create incentives to encourage active participation AND CONSENSUS BUILDING (emphasis mine)

8/ Strategy 1.2.2, strategy implementation of survey (i.e. 1st bullet) - surveys may not be the best or only way to go about gathering the desired specific feedback.

9/ Strategy 1.2.4, strategy implementation regarding training and resources to staff (i.e. 3rd bullet) should be preceded with some effort to identify correct staff resources/gaps, i.e. "Identify and provide training and resources to staff on agile methodologies and best practices." This may help with agility and speed of work.

10/ Strategy 2.1.1 "Improve institutional agility and adaptability: Identify and address ways to enhance policy development processes, operations, and governance." I think there could be calls to just update as opposed to enhance, i.e. 2.1.1 Improve institutional agility and adaptability: Identify and address ways to UPDATE OR enhance policy development processes, operations, and governance. (emphasis mine)

11/ Strategy 2.1.1, strategy implementation related to the use of independent auditors or evaluators (i.e. 4th bullet) should address purpose in addition to effectiveness. i.e. 2.1.1 Utilize independent auditors or evaluators to review ICANN's operations and governance model and provide objection assessments of their PURPOSE AND effectiveness. (emphasis mine).

12/ Strategy 2.1.2 "Preserve ICANN's financial sustainability" should probably include a 5th bullet on strategy for stricter but still reasonable resourcing for ICANN community groups along with better management of expectations to address some of the stated strategic risks.

13/ Strategy 2.2.1 should include "human resource" i.e. 2.2.1 Evolve the hybrid workforce model and optimize regional HUMAN RESOURCE AND office utilization. (emphasis mine) and include a 4th bullet strategy implementation on acquiring and maintaining appropriate HR talents.

14/ Strategy 3.1.3 should include elements of "trust", i.e. 3.1.3 Cultivate consumer choice, competition, inclusivity, innovation, and TRUST. (emphasis mine)

Generally yes but do need more time to think

Strategy 1.1.1 May be reworded to include the following: "Review and reassess ICANN Community Groups to integrate new stakeholders as needed"

I am wondering about how can we measure or track them.

Just go ahead.

Focus on outreach and Engagement areas which without hesitation will bring fresh ideas and mindsets to ICANN.

Create a New Program like a Fellowship one that would last at least 1 year like a sort of internship or scholarship

(3 responses) Voir réponses précédentes

C'est bon comme ça.

RAS / EN version: See previous answers

It's good like that.

RAS

Part B: Draft Operating Plan Framework

Section 5: Operating Plan

1. Are the key activities outlined in the operating plan clearly defined and understandable?

Yes

No

Comments from the Poll:

(4 responses) Sec 5, 1a: Generally yes, but I think there are omissions and improvements to address. See my answer to Sec 4; 5b.

I like the colour coding in particular.

sound good

(3 responses) Mais il me semble compliqué d'analyser un document construit sur la base d'un projet stratégique que l'on vient de commenter et pour lequel nous avons fait des propositions d'évolutions.

Celles-ci pourraient avoir des conséquences sur le plan opérationnel.

Dans la questionnaire il manque l'évaluation des objectifs stratégiques 2, 3 et 4 ?????

Les activités sont bien définies et faciles à comprendre.

RAS / EN version: But it seems complicated to me to analyze a document built on the basis of a strategic project that we have just commented on and for which we have made proposals for developments. These could have operational consequences.

In the questionnaire the evaluation of strategic objectives 2, 3 and 4 is missing ?????

The activities are well defined and easy to understand.

2. Do you agree with the phasing approach for each strategy?

- Yes
 No

Comments from the Poll:

(4 responses) I would agree on the desirability of a phased approach. But I am not seeing any phases delineated in the draft Framework
See my answer to Sec 4; 5b.

xx

it is not very clear

(4 responses). L'approche est bien établie, mais j'espère que nous pourrions mieux faire.
Les 3 couleurs sont utiles pour suivre les priorités des propositions
Effectivement j'approuve l'approche.
*RAS / EN version: The approach is well established, but I hope we can do better.
The 3 colors are useful for tracking proposal priorities
I actually approve of the approach.*

3. Are any key activities too ambitious or unrealistic?

- Yes
 No

Comments from the Poll:

(4 responses) It is pretty much what must be implemented.

I do not think that there is a thing about being too ambitious. If you do not aim high, you will never improve. ICANN should strive for the highest levels possible at all times and learn later why it might have not reached its goals on all levels.

Some are somewhat fuzzy in nature (eg., Build a new generation of leaders)...deep institutional knowledge is required for ICANN to operate, which means old leaders are still required.

(5 responses) questions alambiquées en français mal traduites. Mais des activités réalistes
Il est difficile de se prononcer sur cette question en l'absence d'indicateurs de performance clairs, de connaissance des délais ainsi que des ressources (humaines et financières) pour la mise en oeuvre de chacune des activités

Mais il manque des éléments importants
Je ne pense pas.

*RAS / EN version: convoluted questions in poorly translated French. But realistic activities
It is difficult to comment on this question in the absence of clear performance indicators, knowledge
of deadlines as well as resources (human and financial) for the implementation of each of the
activities.*

But important elements are missing

4. Are there any strategies that are not adequately addressed in the Operating Plan?

() Yes

() No

Comments from the Poll:

(7 responses) 2.2 'Impact' methods and implementation strategies are not well addressed
... Needs expansion.

ICANN has limited resources to educate external stakeholders on the importance of ICANN. We need to emphasize partners with international education and library organizations to leverage educational channels that already exist.

See my answer to Sec 4; 5b.

I don't know better answer

Yes 1.1.5. should be orange instead of blue as more attention should be directed to this strategy
1.1.1 should include something on IMPLEMENTING any gaps identified as they appear.

1.1.5 It would be useful to know how participants heard of ICANN in the first place, and how they discovered that it was something that they might participate in. The weakest part of our efforts is getting that information out to the various communities.

1.3 It might be helpful to include information on how we are evolving the multistakeholder model over time. With specific example of where we found a weakness and addressed it.

In 2.2.2, would it not be desirable to at least take a look at our resource usage beyond just our carbon footprint?

3.2.1 Universal Acceptance is, at its heart, a software issue -- does the software that is being used accept the wider range of TLDs? To encourage UA, it would be helpful if ICANN could provide example software code for at least the most common platforms/software.

4.1 Why am I not seeing anything about encouraging the actual use of DNSSEC? It does no good if it is not used. And if it is not used because it is not fit for purpose, they ICANN should work with the IETF to create something that is.

(4 responses) Les séquestres pour les enchères pour encourager la participation de ceux qui sont plus petit financièrement, les acteurs alternatifs pour le bien public, les acteurs des administrations ou du volontariat mondaile

Celles proposées dans ce questionnaire dans sa première partie.

Il semble difficile de faire plusieurs choses en même temps.

Faire des commentaires et des propositions d'évolution du plan stratégiques et donner son avis sur sa déclinaison opérationnelle.

Pour moi tous les stratégies de ce plan opérationnel sont correcte et pertinentes.
RAS / EN version: Escrows for auctions to encourage the participation of those who are financially smaller, alternative actors for the public good, actors of administrations or global volunteering Those proposed in this questionnaire in its first part.
It seems difficult to do several things at the same time.
Make comments and proposals for changes to the strategic plan and give your opinion on its operational implementation.
For me, all the strategies in this operational plan are correct and relevant.
RAS

5. Are there any overlaps or redundancies in the proposed key activities that could be streamlined?

- Yes
 No

Comments from the Poll:

(1 response) I don't see overlapping issues

(2 responses) Pas pour moi.

Part C: Other General Comments

Section 6: Other Comments

1. Overall, how satisfied are you with the draft Strategic Plan?

- Very Satisfied
 Satisfied
 Neutral
 Unsatisfied
 Very Unsatisfied

Comments from the Poll:

(3 responses)

it covers an array of points that should be debated and practice
Though it is generally a satisfactory draft Strategic Plan, but needs to incorporate objectives, goals, and strategies related to persons with disabilities who are 15 percent of world population and are at a risk of being left behind in the digital innovation if their needs are not adequately addressed.

(4 responses) félicitations, il y a eu un super boulot de l'équipe de l'OFB
Mais il manque qq éléments à prendre en compte ou à rendre plus visible et donc stratégique.
Certaines propositions devraient être de la responsabilité de la revue holistique.
Le projet de plan stratégique est clair et c'est satisfecit pour moi.
*RAS / EN version: congratulations, there was a great job by the OFB team
But there are a few elements missing to take into account or to make more visible and therefore strategic.
Some proposals should be the responsibility of the holistic journal.
The draft strategic plan is clear and that is satisfactory to me.*

2. Overall, how satisfied are you with the draft Operating Plan?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Unsatisfied
- Very Unsatisfied

Comments from the Poll:

(2 responses)

I think it is good but I don't have elements to discuss deeper this question

(4 responses) question pas claire en français, surement encore un probleme de traduction
Il faudra mettre le plan opérationnel en adéquation avec la version finale du plan stratégique.
Il y a des propositions de formation pour le staff qui devraient aussi s'appliquer (au moins) aux leaders de la communauté.
Le projet de plan opérationnel est clair et c'est satisfecit pour moi.
*RAS / EN version: unclear question in French, probably still a translation problem
The operational plan will need to be aligned with the final version of the strategic plan.
There are training proposals for staff that should also apply (at least) to community leaders.
The draft operational plan is clear and that is satisfactory to me.
RAS*

3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for improving the Strategic Plan or Operating Plan?

Comments from the Poll:

(10 responses) No.

Better use of terminology and tagging especially in tables. I had to repeated check what are referred to by "Strategic Objectives" vs "Strategic Goals" vs "Strategies" vs "Indicators", and I can't say that I got them right 100% in my comments!

I think there is a real concern about ICANN's future and mission.

There needs to be something mentioned about "ICANN evolution". I know it is a contentious topic, but is ICANN's mission static? Its broad mission is about "the Internet's identifiers", yet in practice there are many stakeholders who want it restricted to "domain names" and to a lesser extent, "IP addresses and protocol parameters - through the IANA functions" and that's it. Does this mean that if domain names as we know them today, decrease in significance, ICANN's own significance will decrease too?

Incluir mas actividades o programas a la academia (universidades)

Strategic /operating plan should be reviewed / updated as necessary every 12 / 6 months

No really

no

not at the moment

How do members of the community get involved in drafting the strategic plans? I would have loved to be involved. I don't mind getting involved in the future.

(5 responses) Non

ce questionnaire est une bonne initiative, bravo

Non, c'est bon pour moi.

RAS / EN version: No

this questionnaire is a good initiative, well done

No, it's good for me.

4. Other General Comments

Comments from the Poll:

(5 responses) Good luck!

Inclur los jovenes / *(EN: Include the young people)*

No, it is very well designed

Outreach of Strategic and operating plan need to be more and beyond ICANN community

I found this poll really time consuming as it required scrolling in and out of various resources and looking for sections, especially the last two pages where I generally gave up and just answered yes in order to get to completion as I just did not have any more time to devote to it. You should not force yes or no responses. I still have not found the section of the documents/webinars offered as resources that refer to risks.....

(4 responses) RAS

Non

Il manque des questions concernant les objectifs stratégiques 2, 3 et 4. / *EN version: RAS*

No

Questions regarding strategic objectives 2, 3 and 4 are missing.