Report of Public Comments

Title:	ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan

Publication Date:	6 February 2015
Prepared By:	Carole Cornell & Leo Vegoda

Comment Period:

Comment Open Date:	11 Nov 2014 23:59 UTC
Comment Close Date:	~~12 Dec 2014~~ extended to 4 January 2015 23:59 UTC

Important Information Links

Announcement
Public Comment Box
View Comments Submitted

Staff Contact:	Carole Cornell	Email:	carole.cornell@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

ICANN sought input on its Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (v1, FY16-FY20) which contains the following:

- Five-Year planning calendar
- Strategic goals with corresponding Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), dependencies, Five-Year phasing and list of portfolios
- Five year financial model

This report summarizes and analyzes the input received and provides an action plan for implementation.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of eight (8) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	BC
Intellectual Property Constituency	Steven Metalitz	IPC
U.S. Chamber of Commerce	Adam Schlosser	USCC
ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan WG	Giovanni Seppia	ccNSO SOP WG
Registries Stakeholder Group	Paul Diaz	RySG
Center for Data Innovation	Daniel Castro	CDI

| ALAC | ICANN Staff for ALAC | ALAC |
| Noncommercial Users Constituency | Edward Morris | NCUC |

No individual submitted comments.

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

The comments received fell into six broad categories:

1. Planning / Process
2. Five-Year Operating Plan KPIs
3. Five-Year Operating Plan Dependencies
4. Five-Year Operating Plan Phasing
5. Financial Model
6. Other Issues

Some of the inputs received suggested changes to the Strategic Plan upon which the draft Five-Year Operating Plan is based. ICANN adopted its first Five-Year Strategic Plan (FY2016 – FY2020) on 14 October 2014. It was developed over a year through an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder and multilingual process. It enables ICANN's global community to coalesce around a new overarching vision and long-term objectives. The Strategic Plan articulates ICANN's new Vision, restates ICANN's founding Mission, and sets forth five Strategic Objectives and sixteen Strategic Goals, each with Key Success Factors (Outcomes), and Strategic Risks.

We analyzed the points made in the comments received and have summarized them in the table below, which shows the distribution of input across these themes from the contributors.

Respondents	Planning / Process	KPIs	Dependencies	Phasing	Financial Model	Other
Business Constituency		4	1		1	3
Intellectual Property Constituency		5	1	1		3
U.S. Chamber of Commerce		1				2
ccNSO Strategy & Operating Plan WG	2	13		2	6	9
Registries Stakeholder Group		8		4	3	3
Center for Data Innovation		2		1		4
ALAC		3		1		6
Noncommercial Users Constituency		2		1		8
Total (8/100)	**2**	**38**	**2**	**10**	**10**	**38**

The input received is summarized in the sections below. The full contributions are available in the [public comment forum](#).

Planning / Process

Several contributors noted the process improvements that have taken place for this round of strategic and operational planning and the ccNSO SOP WG asked for clarification on the mechanisms for keeping the Five-Year Operating Plan updated in line with community expectations.

Five-Year Operating Plan Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Input on the Operating Plan KPIs was split into three broad areas:

1. Requests for clarification or definition of KPIs and their phrasing
2. Comments on the KPI development and review process
3. Comments on the quality of some KPIs

Examples of the first area include requests for clarity on what the Advice Registry is, and what the DNS/Unique Identifier health metrics will be.

On the second point, there were several comments noting that KPIs need to be reviewed over the duration of the plan to make sure that they and the associated targets remain relevant. For instance, the ccNSO SOP WG noted that it "is vital that the metrics actually measure progress against the strategic goals and objectives, so that they can be understood by all stakeholders and enable monitoring and assessment of progress on an annual basis."

Several comments noted that while some of the KPIs were quite specific, others were less so and referenced indices or health metrics that are yet to be developed. For instance, NCSG noted that "Instead of mentioning the criteria in general terms, specific targeted goals, often numeric in nature, should be indicated." And the ccNSO SOP WG stated that "they appear to actually measure achievement of the strategic goal in question. For example, an 'increase in the number of public comments' may be an indicator of a controversial policy rather than efficient and effective stakeholder engagement."

Five-Year Operating Plan Dependencies

There were two comments on the dependencies in the draft plan. Firstly, the BC asked whether the dependencies identified for 4.3 (Participate in the evolution of a global, trusted, inclusive multistakeholder Internet governance ecosystem that addresses Internet issues) should actually be incorporated in the phasing section of that goal. Secondly, the IPC noted that community bandwidth is not just a dependency for 2.3 (Support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted) but supports ICANN's success in almost all areas.

Five-Year Operating Plan Phasing

Input to the Operating Plan Phasing was split into three broad areas:

1. Requests for clarification or definition of phases and their phrasing
2. Comments on the SO-AC Special Request process
3. Comments on the underlying Strategic Plan

Examples of the first area include RySG's questions about who would be producing the white papers described in 2.2 (Proactively plan for changes in the use of unique identifiers, and develop technology roadmaps to help guide ICANN activities) and the definition of "stable healthy year over year (YoY) growth in the DN industry" in 2.3 (Support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted).

On the second point, there were inputs from NCSG and the IPC on the planned phasing-out of the SO-AC Special Request process and requests for clarification on the overall budgeting process.

There were several requests for changes to the underlying Strategic Plan, which was developed over a year in an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder and multilingual process, and which the Board approved on 14 October 2014. The Five-Year Operating Plan is based upon the Strategic Plan approved by the Board.

Financial Model

Input on the financial model received compliments from RySG and others but also a set of questions and requests for clarification. The ccNSO SOP WG stated that it "finds it difficult to assess whether the proposed activities in the plan are affordable or, alternatively, would result in unacceptable increases or decreases to ICANN's income and expenditure" and the BC requested the clarification of the expenses for new gTLDs. RySG also requested that cost control stewardship be added as a principle in the financial model.

Other Issues

The other issues raised in the input ranged from typographical errors found in the document (BC), through requests for more information about aspects of the plan, such as the meaning of "steward of the public interest" (USCC), and comments on the underlying Strategic Plan the Board approved on 14 October 2014.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

ICANN welcomes the feedback on the structure of the Strategic Plan upon which the draft Five-Year Operating Plan was based. The Strategic Plan was developed over a year through an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder and multilingual process. It enables ICANN's global community to coalesce around a new overarching vision and long-term objectives. It articulates ICANN's new Vision, restates ICANN's founding Mission, and sets forth five Strategic Objectives and sixteen Strategic Goals, each with Key Success Factors (Outcomes), and Strategic Risks. The Five-Year Operating Plan will be updated, when appropriate, for the remaining years within the Five-Year cycle. No changes to the Strategic Plan for FY2016–FY2020 are anticipated, unless a critically significant event or development is observed, such that it would have a significant impact on the strategy for the remainder of the cycle.

Planning / Process

ICANN staff appreciates the confidence expressed by the community in the improved planning process. The Five-Year Operating Plan will be updated each year, using a similar timeframe, to reflect actual performance and how recent events at the time would impact the remaining years in the then current planning cycle. Consequently, the Five Year Operating Plan is one element of our planning process that requires collaborative effort from all aspects of the ICANN community.

Five-Year Operating Plan KPIs

The 20 KPIs identified in the Draft Five-Year Operating Plan were the areas which received the highest number of comments. The overall message received was that more work is needed to refine the KPIs and associated targets, so that they are clearer and more specific. These improvements will be worked on and shared with the community.

The KPI results will also be shared with the community, using a number of mechanisms, so that the appropriate level of detail is available. These mechanisms will include quarterly stakeholder calls, reports at ICANN meetings, and the public dashboard currently being developed by staff.

The questions asked and requests for clarifications have been answered in Appendix B, below and appropriate changes will be included in the updated Five-Year Operating Plan.

Five-Year Operating Plan Dependencies

There were just two comments received on the dependencies identified in the Draft Five-Year Operating Plan. The message received was that the language needs to be clearer. In particular, it was indicated that while community bandwidth is obviously a limited resource in all aspects of ICANN's engagement with the community, the updated text needs to explain the particular issues associated with engaging the community on the evolution of domain name marketplace.

Full answers are provided in Appendix C, below.

Five-Year Operating Plan Phasing

The clarifications requested are given in the Appendix D, below.

The message received on the elimination of the "SO/AC special request process" was that the community is concerned that any replacement needs to provide adequate support for community engagement. The elimination of this process is planned to take place as a consequence of structural improvements to ICANN's planning and budgeting processes. ICANN remains committed to supporting SOs and ACs and will not be reducing that support.

ICANN will begin implementation of the Strategic Plan agreed with the community and approved by the Board as described in this Five-Year Operating Plan. Consultations on changes to the Strategic Plan will take places during FY19 or if a critically significant event or development is observed, such that it would have a significant impact on the strategy for the remainder of the cycle.

Financial Model

The overall message received was that the community is satisfied with the structure of the financial model. However, there were a number of questions and requests for clarification. These have been answered in Appendix E, below and appropriate changes will be included in the updated Five-Year Operating Plan

Other Issues

The typographical errors noted by the BC will be corrected. The questions asked and requests for clarifications have been answered in Appendix F, below and appropriate changes will be included in the updated Five-Year Operating Plan.

Appendix A: Planning / Process

Organization	Comment	Response
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The ICANN Five-Year Operating Plan (2016-2020) represents a great improvement in comparison to the previous efforts made by ICANN to set long term strategies.	Thank you for the comment on the Draft Five-Year Operating Plan.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	With regard to the consultation process about the Plan, we would appreciate further clarification from ICANN on the mechanisms that ICANN plans to adopt in order to keep the Plan updated and in line with community expectations. As a matter of fact, within the various objectives and	The Five-Year Operating Plan will be updated each year to reflect how actual performance and recent events at the time would impact the remaining years in the then current planning cycle. Additionally the Five Year Operating Plan is one element of our planning process and

	goals we note confusing lines on the frequency of consultation.	requires collaborative effort from all aspects of the ICANN community.

Appendix B: Five-Year Operating Plan KPIs

Organization	Comment	Response
BC	The 5% figure is overly ambitious	At the current state of deployment of both DNSSEC and IPv6, we believe that five percent is achievable. In the case of IPv6, we anticipate the exhaustion of the IPv4 free pools in the APNIC, RIPE NCC, LACNIC, and ARIN regions will increase the costs of providing Internet connectivity over IPv4. These increased costs will tend to encourage the use of IPv6, which we believe is already feeling the impact of the "network effect". In the case of DNSSEC, we anticipate increased interest in security features across all areas of the Internet as evidenced by recent IETF activities in response to the Snowden revelations, the Sony hack, and other events, along with interest in deploying DNSSEC-dependent technologies such as DANE will drive DNSSEC deployment. ICANN has already begun encouraging the deployment of validation among resolver operators and will continue to encourage zone administrators to sign their zones.
BC	There is no KPI tied to this, for an understanding of how stable, healthy growth will be measured, despite it being an objective for four of the five years of the plan.	"Stable" is taken to mean non-disruptive to the general operation of the domain name industry. "Healthy" is taken to mean sustainable and without significant negative impact on the domain name industry ecosystem. The stability and health of the domain name industry can be measured by a variety of metrics. ICANN is in the process of working with the community to reach a consensus on which metrics best measure the health of the Domain Name Industry. The initial KPI for this objective is to identify the metrics and subsequent KPIs will be based on a community consensus as to appropriate

		values of those metrics over time.
BC	Establishing a definition and tracking system of "actions by ICANN in decision-making" needs to be established first.	Thank you for your input. We will do this.
BC	No assessment is expected to be performed until FY20. Suggest annual assessments for this important strategic goal.	Staff will work on developing a plan for regular assessments, to take place during the course of the Plan. The results of the assessments will be used to refine the approaches and deployments used to deliver this goal
IPC	Pp. 14-15, same questions as to "DNS/Unique Identifiers health metrics." What are these?	ICANN is currently investigating the metrics that can be used to establish the "health" of the Internet's system of unique identifiers. We are beginning work with DNS-OARC, the Cyber Green Initiative, and others to develop these metrics that will allow the community to monitor the state of the Internet's system of unique identifiers over time in order to determine the effects on that system of the changes put in place by the community.
IPC	Pp. 14-15, same questions as to "ICANN legitimacy survey." What is this?	In a number of venues such as the IGF and the ITU, questions have been raised about the legitimacy of ICANN as the coordinator of the Internet's system of unique identifiers. The ICANN legitimacy survey will be a formal, statistically valid survey, which will measure the perception of ICANN's legitimacy from the perspective of the various components of the global multistakeholder community.
IPC	P. 17: Why is it a goal to "show stable healthy year over year growth in the DN industry" over each of the next four years? Despite evidence of recurrent confusion on this point from some in the ICANN senior staff, ICANN is not a trade association for the domain name industry. Isn't it perfectly plausible for ICANN to achieve its strategic objective of a "robust, stable and trusted domain name marketplace" even if the "industry" is not "growing"?	It is a goal to show stable and healthy year over year growth in the Domain Name industry because the alternative would be unstable and/or unhealthy. Growth can, of course, be zero or negative -- the key is for that growth to be healthy and stable.
IPC	Finally, IPC has a number of questions	We will systematically review and refine

concerning the metrics proposed in the plan as "key performance indicators." We see the suggested metrics as straw men and encourage them not to be cemented, but expressed more generally in the 5-year plan, and solidified with community input to have more practical measures of programmatic success. For example, answers to the following questions could be useful:

Strategic Goal 1.3 (page 12): measuring "active participation" in policy development. Some of this is quantifiable, some of it much less so (e.g., a person who frequently posts to a working group mailing list may be adding little more than "+1"). How does ICANN propose to reflect this qualitative variation in participation in measuring "active participation"?

• Goal 2.3 (page 17): measuring "# of abuse incidents compared to the # of registrants" could be misleading on both ends. This metric could unjustifiably favor registries (or registrars) with high-volume registration models, since a given number of incidents would have comparatively less impact on this ratio. At the same time, unless "abuse incident" is more specifically defined, the numerator of this ratio could lump together technical, "paperwork" type violations with truly serious problems. How does ICANN propose to avoid these pitfalls?

• Goal 3.3 (page 21): "knowledge level of Board, staff and stakeholders": how would this be measured, by whom, and against what standard?

• Goal 4.1 (page 23): the number of MOUs between ICANN and "international organizations" is certainly countable, but

the KPIs as we continue to learn what works well and what needs to evolve. The Five-Year Operating Plan will be updated annually to reflect how actual performance and recent events at the time would impact the remaining years in the then current planning cycle.

Additionally the Five Year Operating Plan is one element of our planning process and requires collaborative effort from all aspects of the ICANN community.

	does this metric take into consideration how meaningful any particular MOU might be in practice? • Goal 4.3 (page 25): "# of governments and other stakeholders willing to have a national multistakeholder distributed IG structure." Why is the metric "willing to have" rather than "having"? Who determines this willingness? Who decides whether a particular nation's "IG structure" (or the structure a particular stakeholder or government is "willing to have") meets these criteria? • Goal 5.1 (page 27): "# of ICANN decisions and advice that are rationalized based on common consensus based definition of public interest based definition of public interest"—does any such definition exist? If it did, could this metric be satisfied simply by reciting the right "magic words" in the stated "rationalization"? If not, how would the number be determined?	
USCC	We also have several questions regarding the objectives related to government involvement. In objectives 4.1 and 4.3, can ICANN please expand upon what is intended by "singing of MOUs with international organizations" and explain what type of duties are envisioned? Further, under objective 4, while we appreciate the desire to increase government participation, particular that of developing nations, it is important to also highlight that an increase in participation will not result in new government powers or in any way alter the current multistakeholder model.	The Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) that ICANN executes with other organizations are mutual recognition documents that endorse ICANN's role and mission and recognize its work coordinating, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers. These agreements do not create extra duties or obligations. They are a mechanism to formalize recognition of the parties roles and where appropriate and in keeping with the missions of the parties to find collaboration opportunities in the performance of those roles. MOUs are posted on the ICANN website. The work done to increase participation of various constituencies in the various SO and AC supports the existing multi-stakeholder model of Internet Governance

		- it does not change the roles of any of the SO or AC nor does it change the relation between them. The effort is to make the model as robust as possible through board support and participation and support the work of the multi-stakeholder model through increasing the available volunteers at a time when the community has understandably raised questions of bandwidth of the existing participants.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The ccNSO SOP WG has provided feedback on the subject of ICANN KPIs for many years. It is therefore very disappointing that some KPIs are missing and/or the proposed KPI's still need significant work and revision regarding most of the goals.	KPIs will be reviewed and refined as we continue to learn what works well and what needs to evolve. The Five-Year Operating Plan will be updated annually to reflect how actual performance and recent events impact the remaining years in the then current planning cycle.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	It is vital that the metrics actually measure progress against the strategic goals and objectives, so that they can be understood by all stakeholders and enable monitoring and assessment of progress on an annual basis. In our view the proposed set of KPIs do not achieve this.	The commenter's point is well taken. KPIs will be reviewed and refined as we continue to learn what works well and what needs to evolve. The Five-Year Operating Plan will be updated annually to reflect how actual performance and recent events impact the remaining years in the then current planning cycle.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	As noted above, it is not clear how this goal is distinct from goal 1.1. We recommend that these two goals should either be unified or made more distinct. • The sole proposed KPI is weak, in that measuring the number of regional strategies and their stage of progress will not necessarily be a measure of regional engagement with stakeholders. If it is decided to measure progress against the strategies, then the KPI should be expanded to cover operations, projects and other activities. • The FY20 aim #1 that 'ICANN participants cover all regions' is queried. The WG believes that this is already the case.	In both instances, the comment reflects thinking that is consistent with upcoming proposed changes to the KPIs in general, specific to this goal. The original intent was to show the design, and project progress of community drive strategic plans. The proposed KPI is intended to be expanded on beyond just completion of projects in the coming FY16. Further changes to the KPI are pending a review of these comments and community input at ICANN 52. In addition to including project status on community plans, these metrics will be expanded to include measurement of outreach as a broader stakeholder engagement plan that includes all stakeholders in all regions. In addition to the KSF of broadening

	• The published ICANN Strategic Plan also included a key success factor of 'more geographic diversity of accredited registrars and registries', but this outcome has not been covered in this section of the Operating Plan, neither does it have a KPI.	registries and registrars, this is a key component in each of the regional strategic plans that are currently being tracked on the individual project level. The suggestion of more detailed reporting on these projects should be taken into consideration when further refining and defining KPIs.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The wording of the strategic goal strongly suggests baseline measures for each of the attributes and year-on-year progress over the life of the plan. However, it is not clear how the planned activities achieve this nor how it is proposed to measure accountability, inclusiveness, efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness. • The metrics are not clear. Neither do they appear to actually measure achievement of the strategic goal in question. For example, an 'increase in the number of public comments' may be an indicator of a controversial policy rather than efficient and effective stakeholder engagement.	The commenter provides some useful perspective on the challenge of developing and defining consistent and effective metrics for assessing accountability, inclusiveness, efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness. The GNSO Council has established a working group to examine the collection of data and metrics for policy making. Once this WG has developing a framework detailing how data and metrics can be obtained from ICANN, third parties, and contracted parties, it plans to identify possible methods for data collection and metrics in relation to the primary work products of WGs. As the commenter notes, additional staff work must be done to identify specific relevant metrics for assessing the other identified success factors. In the meantime, staff is collecting data and metrics on certain basic current community participation metrics like working group attendance and participation and, the capability of current processes to meet existing PDP guidelines and timetables.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The 'unique identifiers operation health index' is both a new term and concept. It is currently incomprehensible to the SOP WG. The meaning and means of calculation for this index should be provided, in order to help determine whether this will be able to successfully measure progress against the strategic goal. • It is not clear whether the 5% year over year improvement in the gap of IPv6 and	ICANN is in the process of establishing these metrics in cooperation with both operational and security oriented bodies. When draft metrics are identified, they will be documented and input from the community will be solicited. At the current state of deployment of both DNSSEC and IPv6, the five percent rate is achievable. In the case of IPv6, we anticipate the exhaustion of the IPv4 free pools in the APNIC, RIPE NCC, LACNIC, and ARIN regions will increase the costs of providing Internet

	DNSSEC deployment is a realistic target for ICANN and whether 'collaboration with the community' will reduce the gap to this, or a larger extent. We note that the ccTLD exemplar in this area was able to achieve a 0% - 30% DNSSEC take up over a two-year period and that DNSSEC is obligatory for new gTLDs.	connectivity over IPv4. These increased costs will tend to encourage the use of IPv6, which we believe is already feeling the impact of the "network effect". In the case of DNSSEC, we anticipate increased interest in security features across all areas of the Internet as evidenced by recent IETF activities in response to the Snowden revelations, the Sony hack, and other events, along with interest in deploying DNSSEC-dependent technologies such as DANE.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The proposed measure of '% of registered domain names to internet users regionally and globally' would measure domain name market penetration, but does not measure the strategic goal as defined. • The 'draft technology roadmap' is a new term and the scope and detail of the roadmap has yet to be defined or explained. Given this status, it is difficult to comment on whether the phasing of the roadmap is achievable or affordable.	Agreed that the metric proposed does not measure the strategic goal as defined. The technology roadmap is intended to help guide ICANN in its coordinative efforts as the use of unique identifiers continues to evolve. Since it is difficult to predict exactly how the Internet's system of unique identifiers will evolve in the future, the technology roadmap will necessarily be fluid and subject to change. However, the initiatives that derive out of the roadmap will be defined using normal ICANN community-driven consensus processes.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The KPIs do not fully measure progress against the strategic goal. For example, KPIs might also measure gTLD and ccTLD registry failures and end user trust in the marketplace in general and TLDs in particular. • The showing of 'stable healthy growth in the DN industry' is shown in FY17-20. However, measures to improve trust and stability could potentially reduce growth and it is not clear that this has been considered in the thinking about this goal.	The commenter's point is well taken. ICANN fully understands that the need to ensure robustness, stability, and trust may impact the growth rate in the Domain Name industry, however we also understand that growth rates can be zero or negative in order to maintain a healthy ecosystem. While at this early stage of the Domain Name industry ICANN does not anticipate a need for a reduction in the rate of growth, robustness, stability, trustworthiness, and health of that industry may at some point dictate that need.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The proposed 'top tier infrastructure uptime' KPI may not be a measurement of the goal which is about ensuring 'structured co-ordination'. Furthermore, we would appreciate to see a cost quantification for the "scaling from 99.9%	The move to 99.999 is planned to take place over five years with the first step being the tiering of ICANN systems and applications. Expected costs would only be identified once this initial process is completed. ICANN will share the process

	in FY 2016 to 99.999% in 2020 for top tier services". It is suggested that the ICANN Technical Community be tasked with developing measurable and achievable KPIs for this area. • The published ICANN Strategic Plan also included a key success factor of 'ICANN is recognised by the global community as having technical excellence and thought leadership', but this outcome has not been covered in this section of the Operating Plan, neither does it have a KPI.	as well as the final tiering with the community once completed as appropriate. The technical capabilities of ICANN are a reflection of the people and thought leadership put in place. To this end, ICANN's strategy is to retain the necessary technology leadership. ICANN's technology leadership experts currently consist of four senior leaders in David Conrad who is a recognized expert in the Internet's system of unique identifiers; John Crain with extensive SSR expertise; Ashwin Rangan in the IT domain and Terry Manderson in his Root Server System role.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The metrics as currently worded are almost incomprehensible. Assuming that they partly relate to the calibre of the ICANN staff team, it would be helpful to add KPIs relating to talent management, staff retention and staff engagement. • The published ICANN Strategic Plan also included a key success factor of 'ICANN is recognised by the global community as having technical excellence and thought leadership', but this outcome has not been covered in this section of the Operating Plan, neither does it have a KPI.	The KPIs for staffing and training are being developed. We are using some of the basic metrics and are researching benchmarking in this area to better understand what metrics are most useful. This is an evolving area that will see stronger, clearer KPIs and metrics in the future. The outcome of this goal is for ICANN's expertise to positively influence the systems that make use of or are dependent upon the Internet's system of unique identifiers coordinated by ICANN. The KPIs associated with having technical excellence and thought leadership would include number and quality of contributions ICANN staff make to technical forums such as the IETF and W3C and the acceptance of those contributions in the form of standards and implementations.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	We recommend the merger of this goal with goal 4.3, as the engagement with the existing Internet governance ecosystem is inevitably linked to the participation in its evolution. The merger of the two goals will also improve the flow of the fourth Strategic Goal.	Thank you for the observation. We appreciate your input on the need for clarity and coordination with respect to the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan's goals and objectives, which were developed through an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up multi-stakeholder and multilingual process, have been adopted by

	• The only KPI seems extremely weak against the goal. The introduction of further metrics is highly desirable because the number of Memorandums of Understanding does not adequately measure the goal, which can be better evaluated with the number of presentations/initiatives/actions. It is not even clear if the KPI refers to the number of formalised MoUs or to the range of stakeholders that have been engaged. • We would also suggest the inclusion of a careful mapping process to assess what the existing Internet governance ecosystems are at national, regional and global levels. Without this kind of initial evaluation, it is hard to set annual goals in terms of "increasing % participation rates" or having "strong working relationships with organisations and entities (…)". As for the last point, we would also like to suggest introducing better wording like "Fully structured working relationships with organisations and entities (…)". The inclusion of a sort of mapping process under the "dependencies" section does not facilitate the understanding of the actions to achieve the goal. Any mapping made in 2015 should be reviewed, as new initiatives might be developed at national, regional and global levels. • We have detected a possible inconsistency in the plan, which encourages engagement with the existing Internet governance ecosystems but in the FY16 phasing refers to increasing the number of IG multistakeholder structures over 2015.	the Board and are final. As such, we cannot merge goals at this time. As we operationalize the Strategic Plan, we will factor your input into our work. The current KPI refers to formalized MoUs. The MoU format will be revised to more clearly to document the signatories support for distributed multistakeholder IG structures. Mapping is anticipated as part of the work and the KPIs will be reviewed for alignment and to avoid repetition. The mapping will also be reviewed when the strategy is reviewed to identify if new initiatives have been developed at national, regional and global levels as this is a measurement for the KPI under 4.3. There is a central body of work and initiatives that will feed the reporting and metrics across the sub goals that roll up to support the Strategic Objective 4.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The entire objective is based on the concept of "public interest" which has a different meaning in different places (countries and contexts). Therefore,	Work was carried out by the Strategy Panel on the Public Responsibility Framework in consultation with the community through webinars and open sessions at ICANN

	agreeing on a definition – that should include clear boundaries – of "public interest" should be at the core of the entire objective.	meetings. We will build on this work moving forward and will work on agreeing on definition of "public interest" within the ICANN context with the community.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	•The KPI for this goal deserves further clarification, especially the "rationalisation" concept. It is difficult to understand what is measured, when and by whom. • The goal lacks sufficient clear metrics and measurable actions.	Thank you for your comment. As noted above, will work on agreeing on definition of "public interest" within the ICANN context with the community and work to tie this to more clearly defined and measurable metrics.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	• We acknowledge that the goal is adequately structured, but the lack of specific metrics does not help the community to adequately monitor the actions and achievements in this area. • As stated for goal 4.4, there must be a clear link with the work of the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) on Accountability. Therefore, the work of the CCWG has to be seen as a dependency while their progress and findings could represent sound KPIs.	We agree that specific metrics are required and we intend to review and refine them as work evolves. This includes the important work of the CCWG, which is expected to impact the goals under Strategic Objective 4.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	• The goal is very ambitious and therefore, would need to be better explained especially considering that it is aiming to engage "under-represented countries and communities and other underrepresented groups". The first step to engage with them should be at least to explain to the overall community how to get more engaged and what ICANN's expectations are. Unfortunately, the goal's paragraphs fail to address these elements. • It would be of paramount importance to further detail the concept of "priority groups" that is introduced in this goal, as it may lead to unpleasant misunderstandings if misinterpreted. The same can be said for the concept of "public responsibility programs". • The only KPI-metric available is extremely poor and, again, it misses the fundamental aspect that in many cases the	The comment regarding targeted outreach being misrepresented is a noted concern in several different parts of the community. However, it is also necessary to engage in targeted outreach in order to get accurate measurements of not just the outreach we are doing, but the level of participation in a certain subset of a region, or within a stakeholder group. The KPI itself is intended to serve as a measurement to find a solid baseline of community and stakeholder engagement, in addition to targeted outreach, and information gathering improvements (meeting registration, and website profile creation). This will enable a better view into what participation looks like outside of the "solid baseline" created by ongoing community participation and growth in those areas alone.

	mere number of actively participating stakeholders is not sufficient to measure the effective empowerment and engagement of any stakeholder. Furthermore, the absolute minimum baseline is missing and makes any future assessment impossible.	
IPC	Strategic Objectives 4 and 5 contain many laudable goals to increase both the quantity and quality of public participation in ICANN. It is important for a broad spectrum of communities, both commercial and non-commercial, to feel as though they can have input into the ICANN process, whether through sustained or periodic participation. To that end, all of the participation mechanisms need to be reviewed, both for their usability and actual influence. It is important to determine whether the issue summaries that are provided are sufficient for meaningful participation in a particular public comment issue, and whether the mechanisms to incorporate the corresponding feedback are indeed functional. For example, decisions scheduled to be made before all public comments have been received, analyzed and responded to suggest a non-functioning influence mechanism. Similarly, metrics such as "number of engagement Reply Comments on Draft 5-Year Operating Plan programs" (strategic goal 1.2) do not get to the heart of public participation, and represent a kind of tautological metric is which by definition easy to achieve.	While directed toward public comment processes, the IPC comments provide some excellent advice for comprehensive consideration of the ICANN participation mechanisms that involve various forms of community input and feedback. As noted by the IPC, reliance on simple number counts will not help the organization to assess improvements to participation. Participation must be useable and influential. The public comment enhancements instituted in January 2015 are only the first step in a broader effort to review, assess and develop comprehensive improvements that will enable effective and sustained improvements to the ability of ICANN decision makers (Board, Working Groups, Drafting Teams, etc.) to solicit, assess and productively incorporate community comments on the work of ICANN. As noted in the Operating Plan document, FY16 will be a period for staff and community collaboration to develop useful measurements and benchmarks.
RySG	Many of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), i.e., metrics, are simply numbers. For example, for Strategic Goal 1.2 on page 11, the metric is "# of regional engagement strategies by type and status (e.g., development, implementation and maintenance)". In our opinion, numbers	The proposed KPI is intended to be expanded on beyond the completion of projects in the coming FY16. Further refinements to the KPI are pending a review of these comments and community input at ICANN 52. In addition to including project status on community plans, these

	in isolation are not very informative and can be very misleading. This type of metric occurs repeatedly for many of the goals. We recommend that they be qualified further to include more context and clarity. Similarly, there are several metrics that are percents; without some context or comparison to other factors, percents may not be very helpful by themselves. We think such metrics need further definition. In short, "Key Performance Indicators" should include meaningful qualitative measures so that the community can see not only what ICANN does, but also gauge its efficiency and effectiveness.	metrics will be expanded to include measurement of outreach as a broader stakeholder engagement plan that includes all stakeholders in all regions. Qualitative metrics regarding stakeholder participation, and the mechanisms by which they choose to participate can be difficult to measure. As such, we are opting to better qualify the outreach ICANN does in order to reach stakeholders in the regions, and likewise ensure that their needs are getting met by measuring the progress and project management milestones of regional strategies.
RySG	The first metric is: "Stakeholder engagement index (e.g., regional/national participation statistics from attendance at ICANN meetings; participation in working groups and initiatives…)". We believe geographic diversity is equally important in working groups participation so would suggest this metric be amended to read: "Stakeholder engagement index (e.g., regional/national participation statistics from attendance at ICANN meetings and in working groups and initiatives…". initiatives…".he second metric is: "% of ICANN organizational functions performed across ICANN". This metric seems to assume that all ICANN organizational functions should be performed across all ICANN organizations and regions. That does not seem like a reasonable assumption. We do not believe that that is a fair assumption and hence suggest that this metric be reworded with more clarity and specificity.	Geographic diversity can be incorporated into the index as suggested, but there may be variances because the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement regions and community-driven regional strategies do not easily match the official "ICANN Regions" for leadership positions and organizational purposes. The second metric is intended to provide a measurement to guide the distribution of ICANN functions across ICANN's hubs and engagement offices. Staff will review the metric and provide an update for the next draft.
RySG	Portfolio 4 is Advice Registry Management. What is the Advice Registry?	The Advice Registry is the registry in which advice provided to ICANN via recommendations from the Advisory Committees is tracked. The Advice Registry is currently being improved. The current

			version can be found [here](#).
RySG	In our opinion, the two proposed metrics are neither **appropriate** nor **adequate** for this important goal (support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted), which involves 11 large portfolios.		ICANN will consider additional metrics to address the other portfolios.
RySG	The first metric reads "# of contractual compliance complaints to ICANN and # of abuse incidents compared to the # of Registrants". It's known that not all "contractual compliance complaints to ICANN" are valid and "abuse incidents" often involve content related or other issues that are not within ICANN's remit. In other words, these numbers are not **reliable** indicators of the health of the unique identifier ecosystem.		ICANN will consider ways to better track and distinguish between valid and invalid abuse complaints and complaints that are within or outside ICANN's remit.
RySG	We commend ICANN for including the second metric (% of GDD Service Level Agreement (SLA) target met). However, there seem to be no specific metrics for the following two portfolios: 5. Contractual Compliance Improvements 6. Contractual Compliance Initiatives		Please note the Compliance function performance against the targets can be found in the Contractual Compliance Update presentations provided at the ICANN Meetings and in the 2014 Contractual Compliance Annual Report to be published early February 2015. Please note compliance metrics established in FY15 to measure compliance functions and performance are now [published monthly](#). ICANN Contractual Compliance requests that the RySG please propose the measures needed with a definition of the measure. Contractual Compliance is not a regulator. The Five-Year Operating Plan includes phasing and annual expected outcomes and deliverables developed based on the current status of GDD building out its services. ICANN commits to measure and report on performance relative to Service Level Agreements, which is envisioned as the logical first phase that can reasonably

| | | be defined and implemented.

Several aspects mentioned in the comment have significant cost implications and ICANN proposes to consider these recommendations in later phases of evolution of GDD Services, based on a structured cost/benefit, Return on Investment type analysis. |
|---|---|---|
| RySG | We note ICANN's Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan (FY16-FY20) included "Regular measurement of stakeholders' confidence in the compliance function" and "Regular measurement of compliance function performance" as proposed measures but it appears that no metric is being proposed in the Draft Five-Year Operating Plan. As stated in our previous comments on ICANN's Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan, we again urge ICANN to:

• Develop and publish a code of conduct (modelled on best practices of comparable regulators) and performance targets for ICANN's Contractual Compliance function; and

• Fund a body (independent of ICANN) to ensure compliance of ICANN's obligations to the contracted parties and conduct annual audits on compliance and GDD operations. | The text "Regular measurement of stakeholders' confidence in the compliance function" and "Regular measurement of compliance function performance" is no longer in the Strategic Plan.

The Compliance function performance against the targets can be found in the Contractual Compliance Update presentations provided at the ICANN International Meetings and in the 2014 Contractual Compliance Annual Report to be published early February 2015.

Compliance metrics established in FY15 to measure compliance functions and performance are now published monthly.

ICANN Contractual Compliance requests that the RySG please propose the measures needed with a definition of the measure.

The Five-Year Operating Plan includes phasing and annual expected outcomes and deliverables developed based on the current status of GDD building out its services. ICANN commits to measure and report on performance relative to Service Level Agreements, which is envisioned as the logical first phase that can reasonably be defined and implemented.

Several aspects mentioned in the comment have significant cost implications and ICANN proposes to consider these |

		recommendations in later phases of evolution of GDD Services, based on a structured cost/benefit, Return on Investment type analysis.
RySG	The metric for this goal says: "# of ICANN decisions and advice (Board, staff and stakeholders) that are rationalized based on common consensus based definition of public interest". We are not confident that there will ever be a 'common consensus based definition of public interest' because the 'public' is extremely diverse with very different interests depending on a multitude of factors. If we are correct, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to ever achieve this metric. Maybe it should be based on something other than a 'common consensus based definition of public interest'.	Thank you for raising the good point of establishing a common consensus based upon common interest. We will take it under consideration on how to achieve this goal.
CDI	ICANN's first strategic objective is: "Evolve and further globalize ICANN." A key success factor of strategic goal 1.3 ("Evolve policy development and governance processes, structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective, and responsive") is listed as: "Decision-making is seen as open, transparent, inclusive and legitimate" (Strategic Plan, p. 10, emphasis added). ICANN should develop an open data portal to improve access to its key data sets. This would support the dependency of "ensuring that improved tools and mechanisms reach and can be accessed by our global stakeholders" (Operating Plan, p. 12). The timeliness of data releases could then be added as a key performance indicator for this goal.	The commenter offers some excellent suggestions for staff to investigate.
CDI	ICANN's second strategic objective is: "Support a healthy, stable, and resilient unique identifier ecosystem." A key success factor of strategic goal 2.3 ("Support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and	The commenter's point is well taken and ICANN commits to work with the community to define a workable set of "open data" practices.

	trusted") is listed as: "Credible and respected industry that is compliant with its responsibilities as demonstrated by open, transparent, and accountable systems, policies, and procedures implemented using best practices" (Strategic Plan, p. 14, emphasis added). Here again, ICANN should adopt open data best practices to ensure that its efforts here are "open, transparent, and accountable." By publishing key data sets about domain name marketplace operations, ICANN can promote trust and stability.	
ALAC	Include SMART implementation metrics in strategic objectives or goals where fit.	Thank you for the comments. We do take the SMART criteria into account.
ALAC	Encourage underrepresented stakeholder groups to engage with ICANN at local, regional, and international levels and to establish metrics that reflect the scope of action.	ICANN continually seeks to engage participants from a broad range of groups, and stakeholders that may be currently underrepresented will change over time. ICANN has recently begun to track stakeholder groups that self-identify during registration for ICANN meetings. Other measures of stakeholder group representation can be included within the overall Stakeholder Engagement Index.
ALAC	Several goals are suggested to be measured by metrics in which the only indicator refers to documents that deal with planning but not with implementation. We therefore recommend that metrics focus not only on planning but also on implementing and that implementation metrics be included in those strategic objectives or goals where fit. We recommend the metrics to be developed based on SMART criteria (i.e. specific, measureable, assignable, realistic, and time-related).	Thank you for the comments. We do take the SMART criteria into account.
NCUC	First, a general comment. While I genuinely like the Metric / Dependency /Phasing design of the Plan, in the future I would like to see more specificity in the Key Performance Indicators (Metrics) and	It should be noted that the nature of most of the KPIs are setting baselines for further refinement and discussion.

	Phasing sections of the Plan. Instead of mentioning the criteria in general terms, specific targeted goals, often numeric in nature, should be indicated. This document should be useful not only as a guide going forward for ICANN staff and management, but should also be purposed for use by the community in evaluating the performance of staff and management. The metrics and phasing text in this document is too vague to allow for its extensive use in this manner.	
NCUC	Although certainly supportive of S.G. 4.1 ("Encourage engagement with the existing Internet governance ecosystem at national, regional and global levels") I question whether the single metric ("number of MOU's with international organizations with mutual recognition of roles with ICANN") in S.G. 4.1 is an exhaustive performance indicator for this S.G. Surely engagement must extend beyond formal institution to institution agreements and should include engagement and participation by community members, ICANN staff and Board in the wider IG world and vice versa. Metrics for this type of engagement should be developed and included in S.G. 4.	We will take your comments into account as we operationalize the Strategic Plan. Additional KPIs may be developed and implemented going forward.

Appendix C: Five-Year Operating Plan Dependencies

Organization	Comment	Response
BC	Strategic Goal 4.3- The dependencies listed appear to belong in the "Phasing" section instead of the "Dependencies" section	We will adjust wording of the dependencies in 4.3 to be clearer.
IPC	P. 18: "Community bandwidth and focus to provide direction and feedback" is listed as a dependency on this page. Why only with regard to financial accountability? Community bandwidth is a dependency for ICANN's success in almost every area –	The commenter correctly notes that community bandwidth is a dependency in other areas. This is a particularly important dependency to address for organizational accountability, technology and operational excellence. Concrete steps include the

	isn't it? Where in the draft plan does ICANN plan to take any concrete steps to conserve and to utilize more efficiently this scarce and dwindling resource?	formation of a Community Engagement and Policy team within ICANN (bridging the Global Stakeholder Engagement team and Policy teams within ICANN, as the groups with the most community facing interactions). This team will be addressing community bandwidth and driving solutions to help utilize this scarce resource efficiently.

Appendix D: Five-Year Operating Plan Phasing

Organization	Comment	Response
IPC	P. 12: The "SO-AC Special Request process" would be eliminated after FY 17. What will replace it? Will these requests be folded into the overall budget process, and if so, how? Or will ICANN simply provide (e.g.) IPC with a "block grant" that it could spend on anything within a menu of possible activities, as we decide would best enhance our effectiveness? Whatever replaces the SO-AC Special Request process will need to be designed and fit for the purpose of significantly increasing concrete ICANN support for the participation of non-contracted stakeholders in the policy development and other work of ICANN. Unless adequately addressed, the huge shortfall in such support will make it impossible for ICANN to achieve many of the other stated goals of its strategic plan. Although ICANN advocates strongly for the multi-stakeholder bottom-up process in its stated goals, its financial commitment toward that end is inadequate to support parity of participation in the process, in particular as to those stakeholders who do not enjoy financial gains from sales of registrations. This is a fundamental structural problem not addressed in the Draft Operating Plan.	The elimination of the "SO/AC special request process" would require that the benefits of carrying out this process are addressed through identified and viable alternative means prior to confirming the elimination. This decision should be evaluated through adequate community consultation and planning of alternative means if relevant. The comment also indicates a "fundamental structural problem" relative to inadequate support of participation, in particular as to those stakeholders who do not enjoy financial gains from sales of registration. Staff believes that the AoC review process provides the opportunity to raise fundamental matters such this one. Separately, as part of the annual budget process, staff is working on developing an SO/AC cost model designed to provide transparency on ICANN's support costs. This information would contribute to a community debate regarding support aiming at improving the effectiveness and value of such support.

ccNSO (SOP WG)	• We suggest this goal be merged with 4.1. • The phasing of this goal is more suited to ICANN coordinating rather than participating in the work. ICANN has a role to be involved, but its mandate is not to be in control of all Internet governance matters.	Thank you for the observation. While the Strategic Plan's goals and objectives are set, so that we cannot merge goals at this time, we appreciate your input and will take it into consideration as we operationalize the plan. ICANN's mission is not to be in control of all Internet Governance matters, nor does it seek to be in control. The goal is to participate in such work in accordance with its mission and within its mandate.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	• The goal seems to be misplaced and it would be rather better positioned under Strategic Objective 3. • There must be a clear link with the work of the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) on Accountability. Therefore, the development of the work of the CCWG should be listed both as a KPI goal and as a dependency. • The goal phasing is debatable as FY16 includes "propose measurements and benchmarks", but it is not clear what they are about (trust?). We believe that any measurement and benchmark should be regularly reviewed and evaluated, instead of being proposed at the beginning of a five-year timeframe. • The entire description of the goal is too vague and cannot be commented on because of the lack of specific action elements	The assessment of current practices and documentation, planned for FY16, in coordination with the development of the Trust Index, should allow us to provide a more detailed set of measure. This set of measures will include relevant external comparison performance data and process benchmarks.
RySG	In various places throughout the plan, there are references to achieving 'community approval' and 'collaborate with community'. We strongly support those references. (See the Phasing for FY16 for Strategic Goal 2.1 on page 14 as well as FY19 and FY20 Phasing on page 15.) In particular we think that it would be a good idea to collaborate with the	In many instances this has effort has already been undertaken throughout the development of the regional strategic plans. The working groups in each of the regions drafted metrics that have been reported on at various points throughout the year.

	community and 'achieve community approval' on all metrics.	
RySG	Item 1 for the FY18 and the FY19 Phasing refer to implementation and assessment of ATRT3 recommendations. What about implementation and assessment of any ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations that may not have been completed at that time? We would like to think that there would not be any, but to our knowledge at the present time, well after the completion of ATRT2, there are still ATRT1 recommendations that have not been implemented.	FY16 includes an assessment of ATRT2 implementation. Should there be a need to carry-over recommendation implementation projects, the operating plan will be adjusted accordingly. While the specific ATRT1 recommendation implementation projects were completed, several were used as stepping-off points for additional improvements and several involve ongoing activity. These efforts were incorporated in various departments' projects and operating procedures.
RySG	For FY17 through FY 20 Phasing, there is mention of publishing white papers. Are these staff produced white papers? Community produced white papers?	The white papers will be produced by staff.
RySG	Item 2 for the Phasing for FY17 – FY 20 say: "Show stable healthy YoY growth in the DN industry". This sounds good but it is not clear what it means. A lot more definition is need for this to be meaningful and measurable.	"Stable" is taken to mean non-disruptive to the general operation of the domain name industry. "Healthy" is taken to mean sustainable and without significant negative impact on the domain name industry ecosystem. The stability and health of the domain name industry can be measured by a variety of metrics and ICANN is in the process of working with the community to reach a consensus on which metrics best measure the health of the domain name industry. The initial KPI for this objective is to identify the metrics and subsequent KPIs will be based on a community consensus as to appropriate values of those metrics over time.
CDI	ICANN's fourth strategic objective is: "Promote ICANN's role and multistakeholder approach." As part of this objective, ICANN has stated "we pledge open, transparent communication" (Strategic Plan, p. 19). ICANN should set a timeline for developing and adopting an open data policy in its Five-Year Operating Plan to make good on its pledge for this strategic objective.	ICANN commits to work with the community to define a workable set of "open data" practices.

Organization	Comment	Response
ALAC	The document states that "Comprehensive regional engagement plans and strategies covering most ICANN regions" will be established in phase 1 for FY16. While we welcome the elaboration of regional engagement plans, we would like to emphasize that these plans should be made for all ICANN regions as opposed to most as stated in the document. We therefore recommend reviewing the wording in order to accommodate the suggested wording and be able to cover all ICANN regions.	The Regional Engagement strategies are community-driven. The current planning anticipates that not all regions will create a Regional Engagement Strategy, but that regional plans and strategies do roll up into comprehensive Global Stakeholder Engagement planning to support ICANN's engagement efforts.
NCUC	I am very concerned about the indication in the FY 17 Phasing of S.G. 1.3 that SO/AC special request processes are to be discontinued. At a time when the ICANN community is being asked to do more and more, a reduced financial commitment by ICANN to the community is unwise. Are there plans to replace the special request process with other programs of financial assistance? If so, what are they?	The key factor that would permit the phase-out of the community special request process by FY17 is that improvements to the core budget development process would render an additional "special" process obsolete. To date, the special request process has been an imperfect system that creates substantial community workload without an apparent corresponding return. Nevertheless, the special request process has identified some significant pilot efforts that have helped expand community support mechanisms and the FY17 aspiration will be dependent on an adequate substitute. The elimination of the "SO/AC special request process" would require that the benefits of carrying out this process are addressed through identified and viable alternative means prior to confirming the elimination. This decision should be evaluated through adequate community consultation and planning of alternative means if relevant.

Appendix E: Financial Model

Organization	Comment	Response
BC	The "Expenses for new gTLD expenses" assumption may can be written another way for better understanding.	We will rewrite the description to be more explicit: "Expenses for the new gTLD program:

		divided between evaluation costs, historical development costs repayment, hard-to-predict costs (including risks). Evaluation costs to be split into direct costs by phase (initial evaluation, extended evaluation, other phases), and overheads (new gTLD team costs, administration costs, costs allocation)."
ccNSO (SOP WG)	Due to limited correlation with the financial information, the SOP WG finds it difficult to assess whether the proposed activities in the plan are affordable or, alternatively, would result in unacceptable increases or decreases to ICANN's income and expenditure.	Staff acknowledges that, under its current proposed format, the Five-Year Operating Plan lacks of resources quantification associated to goals/objectives/portfolios. The current financial modeling relies on the incremental year-on-year variance of expenses from an actual basis, and establishes an equivalence of resources to expenses at the company level. It is expected that, as ICANN's Organizational, Technological, and Operational Excellence programs further progress, the organization will reach the ability to define action plans with sufficient level of details allowing to associate quantified resource requirements, across all portfolios, in a cross functional fashion, and for the entire period.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	With no financial information as yet, it is difficult to assess whether the proposed activities in the plan are affordable or would result in unacceptable increases or decreases to ICANN's income and expenditure. The ccNSO SOP WG has previously recommended that there be iteration of the ICANN Strategic Plan and Operating Plan in conjunction with the budget.	Staff plans to provide a Five-Year financial model that supports the Five-Year Operating plan at the total level, as per the suggested principles, assumptions and content description provided in the draft Five-Year Operating Plan submitted for comment. The model will include the described financial data for the 5 years of the plan, as well as for the previous and current year, for comparison purposes. It is intended that the Five-Year Operating plan is updated on an annual basis, and can be used so that its first year's data becomes the foundation of the assumptions for the next year's budgeting exercise.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The Five-Year Financial Model helps understanding of ICANN's approach to the	The comment on page 31 that states "the financial model is not fixed for a long time"

	management of revenues and expenses. We would appreciate further clarity on the third bullet point on page 31 that states "The Financial Model is not fixed for a long time".	implies that the financial model, being the result of assumptions, should be revised on a recurring basis, be amended as is deemed appropriate at each revision, in correlation with the changes of assumptions. Even though it covers a Five-Year period, it is as valid as the underlying assumptions that defines it remain constant.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	We acknowledge that the assessment – hopefully undertaken at the highest level considering the current available information at multiple levels – of the market and its trends forms the basis of the Financial Model, but we would encourage ICANN to broaden the set of worldwide data to be taken into account in order to have an even better perception of the possible evolution of the domain name environment.	The scope of the market data envisaged to be used should be the one corresponding to the drivers of the revenues collected by ICANN. This scope is the generic worldwide domain name market. It is expected that data relative the country code domain name markets would provide valuable additional information for the planning purposes.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	Risks and opportunities as mentioned in the Strategic Plan are missing in the Financial Model section of the Operating Plan. It would have been worth including a more expanded and further structured list of risks to determine possible actions to cope with each of them.	Paragraph 4.c. of the Financial Model section refers to Risks and Opportunities. We will ensure that the list of Risks and Opportunities included in the financial model include at minimum how those risks from the Strategic Plan that have a financial impact are addressed.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The lack of long-term budget figures does not help the understanding of how carefully ICANN is taking into account different financial scenarios. It would be desirable to have a perception of how ICANN plans to address possible budget decreases. • It is not clear whether the indices proposed in the KPI seek to measure the overall goal or a sub-section of it. On face value, they appear to not measure financial accountability – a measure of stakeholder perception of ICANN's financial accountability may be a helpful addition.	The five-year financial model is aiming at simulating different scenarios as is suggested in this comment. We will consider adding a KPI relative to ICANN financial accountability, which will require extensive stakeholder consultation to ensure relevance and meaning.
RySG	Item 3 for FY17 Phasing says, "Conduct final SO-AC Special request process." Is	This comment does refer to the special budget request process that has been

	this referring to the special budget request process that has been happening for the past few years? If so, why is it the final one? If not, to what does this refer?	happening for the past few years. The Operating Plan is suggesting that this exception process is progressively discontinued and replaced. See also response to the comment from IPC on the same subject.
RySG	We very much commend the budget process improvements in the Phasing for FY16 and the review of those in FY17.	Thank you for the comment on the Draft Five-Year Operating Plan.
RySG	We strongly support the Principles on page 33 but would add one more: cost control stewardship.	The principles enunciated on page 33 only refer to principles that the financial model should be based upon. Further discussion would probably be useful to ensure accurate understanding of the intent and relevance of the suggestion to financial modeling.

Appendix F: Other Issues

Organization	Comment	Response
BC	The BC applauds the initial work on the 5 Year Operating Plan and believes it is directionally consistent with the approved 5 Year Strategic Plan. However, an effective Operating Plan must be consistent in presenting thoughtful and measureable KPIs and the activity detail that can be executed to achieve them. The BC looks forward to reviewing further drafts of the Operating Plan that present the level of detail currently offered in its very well written Strategic Objective 1.	Thank you for the comment on the Draft Five-Year Operating Plan.
BC	Regarding, Phasing FY16 #1, there appear to be two typos - should read "create and publish" revised Accountability and Ethical Framework, and develop "baseline metrics to measure impact" on organization.	Thank you for your input. We will make the corrections.
BC	It appears that all points address new stakeholders. Is it possible that there are no points within this topic that address empowerment of current stakeholders?	Some of the Development and Public Responsibility department (DPRD) programs will focus on empowering current stakeholders.
IPC	Pp. 14-15: Over the next 5 years, the	The "Identifier registration data

	"Identifier registration data access/update system" will be developed, approved, prototyped, revised, beta tested and put into production. What is it? A search of the ICANN site suggests this phrase occurs nowhere but in this document. Please explain this system, and how if at all it relates to the current (Whois) or future registration data system for gTLDs.	access/update system" describes the development and deployment of a unified system to look up registration data associated with the identifiers ICANN coordinates. It is highly likely this system will be based upon the RDAP protocol recently standardized by the IETF WEIRDS working group. Over time, it is anticipated the system deployed by ICANN will replace the existing "Whois" system used by the gTLDs.
IPC	Pp. 23-25: There seems to be a lot of overlap among the three strategic goals discussed on these pages. For example, the FY 18 entry for goal 4.1 and 4.2 (pages 23 and 24) is almost verbatim identical. Can ICANN more clearly distinguish among these goals?	Thank you for the careful reading of the goals. Objective 4 is to promote ICANN's role and the Multi-stakeholder approach. The strategic goals are subsets of that work that may involve ICANN participating with and supporting other Internet Governance organizations and initiatives or encouraging their participation within ICANN. Goal 4.1 is an outward facing goal about engagement with other organizations. Goal 4.2 is about encouraging participation of other entities within ICANN - it is inward facing about support of ICANN and its multi-stakeholder model through those that participate in ICANN. The FY18 phasing is where we hope to be and what steps we would be taking on these different initiatives at that stage - the actions or information gathered might be the same but the purpose to which it is directed is different.
USCC	The U.S. Chamber of Commerce appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on ICANN's five-year operating plan (Plan). While we understand the desire to increase participation in ICANN, we note that a number of areas in the Plan seem to indicate an intention to expand the scope of ICANN's mission. We urge clarifications to the Plan to unambiguously affirm any ICANN activities remain firmly bounded by its core mission "to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers,	The intent of the Five-Year Operating Plan is to more effectively stage the work of ICANN, not to expand ICANN's mission. The objective and the goals supporting the objective are to ensure support for ICANN's core mission and participation in the multistakeholder model that ICANN uses to fulfill its mission "to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems."

	and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems."	
USCC	In several areas of the Plan (notably objective 1.3 and throughout objective 5) there is a mention of "policy development" or serving as a "steward of the public interest." Both of these phrases can be interpreted exceptionally broadly. ICANN has an important role to play in enforcing its own governing agreements including the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. We are also concerned about recent indications of ICANN attempting to take on new roles and responsibilities outside of its core mission, including efforts to launch initiatives unrelated to the management of the names and numbering system. ICANN plays an integral role in the global multistakeholder ecosystem of Internet governance, but there are many issues and, therefore stakeholders, that fall well outside the scope of ICANN's core mission. It is a mistake to attempt to turn ICANN into or to use ICANN resources to solve the many Internet Governance related concerns nor should ICANN attempt to insert itself into every Internet Governance issue stemming from Internet-related activity. The Plan should affirm that ICANN's role in policy development is only directly and tangibly related to policies that will strengthen its core technical functions.	Staff will collaborate with the community to better define the term "public interest" to assure consistency with ICANN's mission and Bylaws mandates. It is specifically noted in the Objective 5 dependencies that the Community, Board and Executive need to be involved in a dialogue regarding the appropriate public interest definitions and framework to hold as an ICANN standard.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The working group recommends that the Five-Year Strategic Plan, Five-Year Operating Plan and Annual Operating Plan continue to be presented to the community in the same format to facilitate their reading and ensure fast and appropriate community feedback.	Thank you for your comments. They are currently aligned and we have no plans to changes the format of either document.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The ccNSO SOP WG believes that the Operating Plan and Budget should not serve to "complement" the approved long-	The commenter's point is well taken. The Five-Year Operating Plan, although aligned with the organization strategy, it has a

	term Strategic Plan, but should be both the translation of high-level objectives and goals into measurable actions to be implemented to achieve the Strategy Plan objectives and goals, and the key guidelines for the ICANN staff and the community to steer subsequent work, assess its progress, eventually implement corrective measures and accurately evaluate any achievement.	functional focus. The KPIs will be updated annually to reflect how actual operational objectives are being met. Additionally the Five Year Operating Plan is one element of our planning process and requires collaborative effort from all aspects of the ICANN community.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	We are pleased to see the IANA functions included in the Operating Plan, but feel that further iteration would be helpful.	Please clarify where iteration would be helpful.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	Several objectives and goals seem to be duplicated. To ensure full clarity of the objectives and overall goals, as well as to improve the general flow of the document, it would be desirable – if not necessary in some cases – to merge several goals (e.g. Strategic Goal 4.1 and 4.3 where it seems more logical that any encouragement to further engage in the existing Internet governance ecosystem is accompanied by actions to monitor and participate in the ecosystem evolution, unless the meaning of Strategic Goal 4.1 is "passive" engagement).	We appreciate your input. The Strategic Plan's goals and objectives, which were developed through an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up multi-stakeholder and multilingual process, have been adopted by the Board and are final. As such, we cannot merge goals at this time. As we operationalize the Strategic Plan (including goals 4.1 and 4.3) we will factor your input into our work. In the case of 4.1 is about ICANN's participation in existing Internet Governance structures and the various portfolios that support that work while 4.3 reflects ICANN's commitment to work with the community an the evolution of those structures and initiatives to address needs and concerns raised by the community.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	The working group recommends that the Five-Year Strategic Plan, Five-Year Operating Plan and Annual Operating Plan continue to be presented to the community in the same format and outlook to facilitate their reading and ensure fast and appropriate feedback.	They are currently aligned and we have no plans to change the format of either document. Please explain what changes you believe are necessary and why.
	It is not clear how this goal is distinct from goal 1.2. We recommend that these two goals should either be unified or made more distinct. • It is not clear how the ICANN regional	The goal in 1.1 is distinct from 1.2. 1.1 refers to an overall measurement of ICANN's global stakeholder engagement. 1.2 is focused on efforts toward regional engagement and communication with stakeholders. The regional engagement

initiatives are included within this goal and our view is that some are lacking momentum and progress.

• We suggest adding a KPI that measures stakeholder satisfaction with ICANN's regionalization and globalization by region and the early establishment of a baseline in order to measure progress made. The survey for this could also provide the opportunity for any service related feedback.

• We assume that the second proposed KPI '% of ICANN organisational functions performed across ICANN' is missing the word 'hubs' at the end.

• We also suggest adding a KPI that measures changes in the current number and geographic hub distribution of ICANN staff at all levels (by function and location) with a baseline and target FY20 number and distribution. Yearly targets for this KPI should also be added.

• Neither of the two proposed KPIs measure the 'efficient, effective and responsive' elements of the strategic goal and we recommend these should be added.
• The phasing text, particularly in relation to regional communications strategies, appears to miss the opportunity for the establishment of a baseline measure of stakeholder awareness and engagement for each region and then the measurement of improvements year-on-year. Our strong view is that this would be a better measure compared to the measuring progress of the strategy which seems to be suggested e.g. 'FY17 Sustain implementation of communications strategy'.

strategies are part of 1.2. The suggestion to add a KPI measuring stakeholder satisfaction is included in the overall stakeholder engagement index for 1.1. The second proposed KPI is missing the word 'hubs' at the end and this will be corrected. The suggested KPI for measuring changes in number and geographic distribution of staff will be considered, but putting targets on this measurement may create negative pressures for hiring and staff retention. This should be discussed further. The phasing test is a reasonable suggestion.

ccNSO (SOP WG)	To ensure a truly bottom-up approach, we believe that ICANN should strengthen and refine the consultation mechanisms with its stakeholders to understand what the community expectations really are before properly addressing them in the plan.	ICANN is constantly seeking improvements in community consultations in order to reach a wide spectrum of views during the development of proposals. This suggestion is a good one and ICANN efforts to strengthen consultation mechanisms are being developed, for example with the improvement of the Public Comment process and implementation of ATRT2 Recommendations. There is a measurement, in the current internal planning process that allows for the tracking and measurement of stakeholder engagement, each Strategic Plan for the region - which will eventually be published - includes outreach to each major stakeholder group in at least once per quarter in different parts of the region.
ccNSO (SOP WG)	We recommend a change in the title of this goal. We believe the current government engagement in ICANN processes is clear, as it is the commitment of most of them not only to support the global Internet ecosystem, but to highlight the various communities interests in the ecosystem. • The only Key Performance Indicator – "Increase the number of GAC members (level of actual active participation and level of representation at ICANN meetings)" is very superficial and mixes two elements of government engagement that are the mere attendance of meetings and the proactive participation. • The entire goal phasing is again linked to a very simplistic increase in numbers (of governmental entities, of frameworks for partnerships) with little if no attention paid to increasing the quality of engagement. A well developed survey of the governmental constituency should be introduced in the phasing stage, or even at	Thank you for the observation. The Strategic Plan's goals and objectives, which were developed through an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up multi-stakeholder and multilingual process, have been adopted by the Board and are final. As such, we cannot rewrite or rename goals at this time, we appreciate your input and will take it into consideration as we operationalize the plan.

	the beginning, to investigate the areas where ICANN should work more with governments. • Certain statements are wrongly based on the assumption that the ICANN community share the same views on certain Internet matters. For instance, what does ICANN define as a "positive outcome of the ITU plenipot"?	
IPC	Strategic Objective 5 runs the risk of circular logic. At long last the "global public interest" in the context of ICANN's mission should be defined, so that further efforts surrounding the global public interest are bound by that definition. The global public interest should be defined around ICANN's mission, to act as a set of a guide rails when determining whether ICANN's actions are in the global public interest.	The definition was developed and proposed by the Strategy Panel on Public Responsibility framework. The Panel defined the global public interest of the Internet as ensuring that the Internet "becomes, and continues to be, healthy, open, and accessible across the globe". Recognizing that this is a broad concept that permeates all of ICANN's work, the Panel determined that for practical and operational reasons "public responsibility" work should be streamlined through one department tasked with serving the community, broadening it, and facilitating participation through specific and measurable tracks. Building on the work of the Panel and community requests, the DPRD is an operational department focused on public responsibility work centered on the priorities and focus areas identified through the regional engagement strategies and through community engagement with the Panel. The DPRD functions in collaboration with regional VPs, other ICANN departments, external organizations, and through engagement with Governments, ccTLD admins, and GAC members in developing and underdeveloped countries who serve as key entry points to these regions so that we can assist in strengthening IG structures

		leading to eventual handover to SO/ACs and the wider community."
RySG	Some descriptions in the plan refer to programs, processes, etc. that in our view are not commonly known. When in doubt, such programs should be explained in a footnote or some other manner. We cite specific examples in the detailed comments that follow.	Thank you for the feedback. ICANN has developed an extensive learning framework and we will link to this in the next version of the Plan.
RySG	Item 4 for FY16 Phasing says, "Evolve Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Secretariat Pilot program into permanent support status." What is the 'Secretariat Pilot program'?	In response to community requests over the past several years, staff developed and deployed a pilot secretariat support program for the non-contract party communities of the GNSO - see action and budget description here. This pilot program (launched in August 2014) is designed to provide in-kind support to help the impacted GNSO communities with contracted part-time (12 hours per week) administrative support (e.g., call management, meeting support, membership database, election support, etc.) and is designed to collect metrics to assess the effectiveness of those services both in terms of delivery and execution. Based on the assessments and metrics collected, determinations will be made whether to continue the program, expand it to other communities or cease the pilot effort.
RySG	This objective is titled, "Promote ICANN's role and multistakeholder approach". But most of the objectives seem to be government related. We certainly recognize that governments and IGOs are important in the multistakeholder approach and we understand the challenges of getting governments to fully participate in multistakeholder processes, but they are just of part of the community. Should this goal be renamed "Promote the role of governments and IGOs in the multistakeholder approach"? If so, what	Other stakeholders are addressed in the Regional Engagement metrics in Strategic Objective 2. It is important during this time of focus on ICANN's accountability and coordination that ICANN have metrics to measure IGO & government participation in ICANN. This does not diminish the participation of other stakeholders and we believe these are captured in metrics in other areas of the Operational Plan.

	about ICANN's role and the multistakeholder approach with regard to other stakeholders? It would be unfortunate to become so government focused that we sacrifice some of the value of the multistakeholder approach.	
CDI	One important step that ICANN should take to operationalize these commitments to openness and transparency in its Five-Year Operating Plan is to establish an open data policy and develop an open data action plan. In addition, it should develop an open data portal to provide convenient and accessible access to key data sets.	The commenter's point is well taken and ICANN commits to work with the community to define a workable set of "open data" practices.
CDI	Open data commitments build upon existing freedom of information policies by establishing "open by default" rules for organizations. Developing an open data action plan for ICANN, would allow stakeholders the ability to prioritize high-value data sets for release, ensure data sets are released in a timely and complete manner, and ensure machine-readability so that data sets can be analyzed and visualized. All of these efforts would help improve the transparency of ICANN operations and bring ICANN's transparency efforts in line with other leading global organizations.	The commenter's point is well taken and ICANN commits to work with the community to define a workable set of "open data" practices. Existing structured data sets include the IANA registries, and zone file publication systems, and L-root performance data. Planned structured data deployments include a future requirement for Registrars to deploy RDAP.
CDI	ICANN's fifth strategic objective is: "Develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission." A key success factor of strategic goal 5.2 is "Promote ethics, transparency and accountability across the ICANN community" (Strategic Plan, p. 26, emphasis added). Once again, a clear commitment to open data would move ICANN in the right direction towards realizing this goal. Notably, ICANN's strategic plan recognizes the potential harm to its fundamental legitimacy and authority if the organization fails to fully embrace transparency. The two strategic	Thank you for your input. We would appreciate more information about your suggestion.

	risks associated with this goal are "harm to ICANN legitimacy due to failure to comply with accountability and transparency processes" and "failure to achieve international agreement on the evolution of the accountability and transparency obligations." Establishing an open data policy, action plan, and portal would help more thoroughly embed the values of openness and transparency within datainnovation.org ICANN's culture and enable stakeholders and the broader Internet community greater insight into ICANN activities.	
CDI	All of the key performance indicators that are part of the ICANN Five-Year Operating Plan should be published as open data. Publishing these metrics would allow the community greater insight into ICANN's performance, promote accountability, and allow stakeholders to build tools to analyze and visualize ICANN performance.	Thank you for the comment. The vision is to measure the organization performance and present the information in an accessible way. The intent in publishing metrics is to present data and causal relationships that have already been identified so they can be monitored without requiring effort or interactivity. The purpose will be to allow people to rapidly monitor relevant and critical information at a glance.
ALAC	Include an assessment of the possible impact that the IANA stewardship transition may have in ICANN's operations.	Thank you for your comment. As the IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition and related efforts progress, assessment of impact will be factored into ICANN's operating plan and addressed in within Strategic Objectives 2, 4 & 5.
ALAC	Change the wording to reflect the vision that stakeholder engagement is to be encouraged by the wide ICANN community, not just by the staff.	As staff is part of the community, this vision can that stakeholder engagement is to be encouraged by the wider ICANN community can be incorporated.
ALAC	Change the wording "most" to "all" in the sentence "Comprehensive regional engagement plans and strategies covering most ICANN regions."	In addition to all regions being supported by organizational engagement plans, also continue to provide support for the development of comprehensive Community driven regional engagement plans for all regions that express interest in development of a regional strategic plan.
ALAC	We are concerned that the document does not take into account the possible	Thank you for your comment. As noted above, the IANA Functions' Stewardship

	impact, if any, that the IANA stewardship transition may have in ICANN's operations. Therefore, we recommend that an assessment be made of the possible impact that the IANA stewardship transition may have in ICANN's operations.	Transition and related efforts progress, assessment of impact will be factored into ICANN's operating plan and addressed in within Strategic Objectives 2, 4 & 5.
ALAC	The document seems to suggest that stakeholder engagement is to be encouraged by staff only. In this regard, our vision is that stakeholder engagement must be a task carried out by the community, including staff, but not just by staff. We therefore recommend that the wording in the document refers to the wider ICANN community, in general, and not only to staff.	As noted above, this change has been incorporated.
ALAC	We have repeatedly recommended that awareness and participation fostering efforts must be done at local, regional and international levels, especially with underrepresented stakeholders, regardless of their economic strength or development. We therefore recommend that engagement is encouraged with these communities and at these three levels, establishing metrics that reflect the scope of action not only with international organizations but also with regional and local entities.	ICANN's engagement with regional and local entities is reflected in the GSE regional engagement strategies and plans.
NCUC	I applaud strategic goal 1.1 (S.G. 1.1), to "further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions." Yet I am concerned that the only mention of languages is a commitment to making "meeting sessions available in multiple languages; languages / scripts represented in ICANN community participation". ICANN needs to do better.	The support provided related to multilingualism does not only refer to interpreting and languages / scripts represented in ICANN community participation.

Language Services is currently providing the following support:
- Translation of announcements, blogs, press releases, and almost all published documents.
- Interpretation during ICANN meetings of all GAC sessions, all sessions in main ballroom, all ALAC and RALOS sessions, and some |

		other sessions when requested. • Teleconference interpretation in all UN languages + PT for any call. Transcription of all sessions during ICANN meetings, in all the supported languages as well as transcriptions of all teleconference calls, in all the supported languages. • Scribing during ICANN meetings of all sessions in the main ballroom, all GAC sessions, and all ICANN Board sessions. • Additionally, scribing, interpretation and transcription support is also provided during special meetings (i.e. ICG), regional meetings, roadshows, Board retreats and workshops, etc.
NCUC	I'm not sure what entirely is meant by the later part of this commitment. If it is a commitment for ICANN to assist community groups such as SO's and AC's to better operate in multiple language I applaud this offering. No longer should or can ICANN afford to operate at any level solely in theEnglish language. Specifics as to the programmatic assistance ICANN intends to provide the community would be most welcome. I am concerned that there is no specific mention of any aspect of languages in the phasing section of S.G. 1.1. Languages themselves are not even mentioned in S.G. 1.2 (regional engagement), which itself must be an error of omission.	Supporting ICANN's regions through regional engagement (engaging stakeholders in their own language will vary by region and expertise). There is no omission of language services in 1.2 as this is part of engaging stakeholders regionally and captured in the Stakeholder Engagement Index in 1.1.
NCUC	I am also concerned about the term "multiple languages". Simply translating meetings and materials into the six official United Nations languages is not sufficient. There are ten languages in the world with over 100 million native speakers; 60 languages with over 20 million native speakers. If ICANN truly wants to globalize and regionalize ICANN functions it needs	This comment is noted and will be taken under consideration by the Language Services team. It should be noted that ICANN has expanded its work on language localization through pilot projects such as in Korea and will continue to look at ways to communicate effectively with regional stakeholders. Language localization efforts are being piloted in the Regions.

	to commit to produce basic materials in as many languages as possible and to expand intelligently the number of languages it offers more extensive services, such as real time translation of meetings, in.	
NCUC	One can not participate in ICANN if one can not understand any of what is going on. "One World / One Internet" is only a phrase unless and until ICANN's communications and participatory strategies encompass a truly global linguistic commitment. The Finnish speaking teenager in Ivalo, the Begali speaking grandma in Kolkata and the Korean speaking teacher in Yanji all should have online access to basic ICANN documents in their native tongue.	The Office of the CTO is investigating technologies that will permit translation of various ICANN communication methodologies into a larger spectrum of languages. We anticipate an experiment/non-production pilot project making use of some of these technologies in FY16.
NCUC	In the S.G. 3.3 portfolio mention is made of ICANN Technical University. This institution is mentioned nowhere else in this document nor is indexed by the major search engines. Please educate myself and the community on the nature of our own I.T.U. and it's proposed role in "developing a globally diverse culture of expertise" (S.G. 3.3).	The ICANN Technical University is an initiative to provide formal training on the technologies related to the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN coordinates. The intent of the I. T. U. will be to improve community members' understanding of the technical aspects of the Internet so that the implications and constraints of those technologies, and ICANN's role in the coordination of the identifiers used by those technologies, can be more fully appreciated. This initiative is still in the planning stage and more details will be published as soon as they are available.
NCUC	While certainly supporting the participation of more governments within the GAC (sole metric for S.G. 4.2), I do question why this stakeholder is receiving such special consideration in the five year draft plan as opposed to other stakeholders. Indeed, much of Strategic Objective 4 ("Promote ICANN's Role and Multistakeholder Approach) is government and IGO centric to the exclusion of all other stakeholders. This certainly is not true	Goal 4.2 is specifically about clarifying the role of governments in ICANN and working with them to strengthen their commitment to supporting the global Internet ecosystem. Because the two portfolios that roll up to the goal are Support GAC Engagement and Engagement with Governments and IGOs increasing the number of GAC members was deemed an appropriate KPI for this goal. The KPIs for the other goals within strategic objective 4 include governments but are not limited to

	multistakeholderism, a concept ICANN lauds in philosophy but often has trouble implementing in practice.	governments and IGOs. The efforts to encourage government participation in ICANN and their endorsement of multistatkeholder models for Internet Governance Organizations at national, regional and international levels are part of the effort to encourage participation from all stakeholders and provide governments with successful models that are not solely multilateral.
NCUC	I would suggest that ICANN needs to commit itself to helping strengthen the commitment of all identifiable stakeholder groups to the global Internet ecosystem, and not to give special consideration to a group, governments, which are already privileged both in the ICANN governance structure and elsewhere.	Thank you for the important observation. ICANN is committed to engaging all stakeholder groups. The regional outreach and engagement strategies are initiatives facilitated by the Global Stakeholder Engagement department that reflect the priorities of the communities identified by all sectors of the community not just government. That work is reflected in KPIs reported in the ICANN dashboards.
NCUC	S.G. 5.1 commits ICANN to act as a "steward of the public interest" as part of Strategic Objective 5: "Develop and Implement a Global Public Interest Framework Bounded By ICANN's Mission". The sole metric of S.G. 5.1 refers to a "common consensus based definition of public interest". Does such a definition currently exist? If so, what is it? If not, how does ICANN propose to develop one?	The definition was developed and proposed by the Strategy Panel on Public Responsibility framework. The Panel defined the global public interest of the Internet as ensuring that the Internet "becomes, and continues to be, healthy, open, and accessible across the globe". Recognizing that this is a broad concept that permeates all of ICANN's work, the Panel determined that for practical and operational reasons "public responsibility" work should be streamlined through one department tasked with serving the community, broadening it, and facilitating participation through specific and measurable tracks. Building on the work of the Panel and community requests, the DPRD is an operational department focused on public responsibility work centered on the priorities and focus areas identified through the regional engagement strategies and through community

		engagement with the Panel. The DPRD functions in collaboration with regional VPs, other ICANN departments, external organizations, and through engagement with Governments, ccTLD admins, and GAC members in developing and underdeveloped countries who serve as key entry points to these regions so that we can assist in strengthening IG structures leading to eventual handover to SO/ACs and the wider community.