

BARCELONA – ICANN 5-Year Strategic Planning: Strategic Direction, Prioritization, and Community Input  
Monday, October 22, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 CEST  
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

RAM MOHAN:

Welcome to this workshop session on the ICANN five-year strategic planning, both the process as well as where we are so far. This is a follow-up to the Webinar we did on October the 10th. And we wanted to come back to you in the community, give you a sense of where we have gone further from there, and also solicit your feedback and your input.

The panel here, I'm Ram Mohan. I'm on the ICANN Board for just another three days, I think, the SSAC's liaison to the Board. And I have been leading this process on behalf of the Board, the strategic planning process on behalf of the Board.

To my right is Theresa Swinehart. Theresa is SVP of the MMSI work inside of ICANN. And from the ICANN Org side, Theresa has been the lead.

Also, with us here, further to my right, is Matthew, Matthew Shears. Matthew is an ICANN Board member. And to my left is Maarten Botterman who is also on the ICANN Board.

Now, we were expecting a few others to come in but the tyranny of parallel sessions and scheduling is what you are seeing. There are a few others, and you'll find folks coming through as they finish up other commitments and come to this meeting.

---

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

Theresa, may I hand this off to you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Sure. Great. Wonderful. Thank you, everybody, for being here. This is a follow-on from the discussions we've had and also the recent Webinar and as we flagged, we wanted to have a session at this ICANN meeting to really kick off this important conversation. So we're going to start the session with a 30-minute presentation or so where we're going to provide a couple things. One is an overview of the strategic planning process more generally, clarifying the purpose of the changes to the strategic planning framework for the FY20-21 to FY25 time frame and present the findings from the strategic outlook and trends-related sessions.

Many of you had participated in those sessions also at the last ICANN meeting in Panama. And it's really the culmination of all of that work together with the work that ICANN Organization and the Board had done. And we wanted to present those findings and the subsequent analysis that has been conducted by the Board and the organization.

But really most importantly, this session is really a chance for a dialogue and a conversation. We want to hear from you on the challenges and opportunities of strategic direction and also your input on what the findings in the analysis are.

We're going to keep the presentation to under half an hour so that we at least have an hour for discussion. And with that, we are going to -- there we go. I actually was successful as doing the clicker.

Give you a quick overview of the elements that we have. So as you know, the strategic planning process is an important part of our governance. It ties into then the operating planning process and the budget planning process. So that's coordinated very closely.

There's a couple elements of it that you can see here, or the building blocks really. It's the strategic outlook and the trends-related results. That helps provide and inform the strategic planning process.

It's the long-term financial forecast dialogues. It's the accountability indicators that we have in place. And that moves then into the strategic plan, the operating plan, and the annual operating plan and budget, which we are coordinating. And we'll be putting each of those out obviously for public comment.

The strategic plan itself will set the direction for the next five years and with that also help prioritize the areas of work that relate into the operating plan and then our budget planning process.

So with that, let me turn it back over to Ram with the elements, and we'll begin the presentation. And we're happy to take any questions.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Theresa.

So the strategic plan itself is composed of three main components: Vision, mission, and a set of strategic objectives and goals. The vision is quite different from the mission. The vision is an inspirational statement about the future. It describes what we want ICANN to

ultimately become as a living organization serving the public interest and the next few billions of Internet users.

Whereas, the mission is a factual statement about the present and it describes what we actually do on a day-to-day basis and is clearly and explicitly stated in the ICANN bylaws.

The third component of the strategic plan are the strategic objectives and goals. And these are the actions that we will take to fulfill our vision and deliver on our mission over the five-year horizon of the plan. In addition to these three components, for the first-time ever in ICANN history, we will develop a fully costed five-year operating plan that will show not only how but also at what cost we will implement our chosen strategy. And this is so that we can share with you and we can demonstrate that the strategy is both realistic and affordable.

Theresa -- one of the things that Theresa and myself have been doing in collaboration has been to work through the various steps of the strategic plan and look at how to analyze all of the data that has come through. Strategic planning, as many of you know, is a journey. And in the ICANN area, it really is a collective effort of the community, the Board, and ICANN Org.

The strategic planning process includes four phases. And you can see them on the screen in front of you. We are currently in phase 3 of these four phases.

In phase 1, the work that we did was to identify trends. And to do that over the course of this calendar year, we have held 25 sessions, ten

Input

---

sessions with the community, one with the Board, and 14 with the ICANN Org to collect input on trends.

The next thing that we did was in phase 2, the prioritization and analysis phase, the Board used the inputs from all of you in the community to identify and analyze trends and further to analyze the impacts on ICANN.

Since April of 2018, the Board has had four face-to-face meetings and 13 calls dedicated solely to strategic planning. The results of this work was presented during a Webinar at the beginning of October, October the 10th. And we will go over the results again in this session.

Where we are right now is at phase 3: Drafting of the strategic plan. And that work is being done with input from the community today. And our intent is to assemble a draft strategic plan, bring it back out into the community for public comment and our intention is to have that out in November.

The last phase, which has not yet commenced, is the finalization of the draft strategic plan. And that work will be done based on the inputs received in the public comment period and, if necessary, we intend -- the Board intends to schedule another public comment period or perhaps a session in Kobe during ICANN64.

This slide gives you a -- kind of a different view of where we are in the process and this provides you an idea of the time line. The upper section that you see that says "Board and Org" shows you on the time line the various pieces of work that the Board and Org have embarked

Input

---

upon. And the lower part shows all the places where we have come back into the community and asked you for your assistance, for your input, and for you to help identify what the main trends are.

At the end of the day, it is the community that decides where ICANN should be in five years. The next rendezvous point for the community after today's session will be the first public comment period of the draft strategic plan in November. And you see that on the slide in front of you.

So with that as a foundation and as a basis for what's coming, let's spend a few minutes speaking to you about the findings from the analysis that the Board has conducted over the past few months.

Matthew and Maarten are going to be presenting these findings. What our plan here is to please allow Matthew and Maarten to run through the presentation all the way first. And once they're done with it, we'll open up the floor for discussion, to hear your thoughts, and to commence this dialogue on where we should go on the strategic plan.

So with that, I'll hand it over to you, Maarten -- Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Ram. So what I'm going to describe now in a little bit more detail is a process we used to get to the key focus areas and the findings themselves. So you can see on this slide the process that we went through, and I'll walk through that.

What you should say first, though, is that the Board has followed what you would call a fairly classical approach to strategic planning that has been adjusted to align with our bottom-up multistakeholder model to ensure that we account fully for community involvement. This has been a collective -- a collective effort.

You'll note the number up on the top of the slide of 1400 hours. Quite a significant commitment of time. 800 of those hours came from the trend work that the Board, the community, and the Organization went through. And another 600 hours were from Board work. And I should note that the Board had created a specific strategic planning caucus group to address this and to bring this work product forward.

So with those as Ram has outlined before, we had these 25 trend sessions. We had 1,000 inputs, as you can see. And then we went through a process of analyzing the workshop results so we categorized the data elements. We did some statistical analysis based on the volumes of data and attributed and then we counted the number of votes attributed from the data elements and came to these, narrowed the focus down and came to these particular focus areas.

Once we have done that, we then actually went and looked at the results from the Board, the community, and the Org identification exercise. And research was then conducted on those findings from publicly available materials to validate the reality of the inputs collected.

One of the interesting things to note here is the commonality of themes that were brought up by different parts of the community, which in and of itself is a form of validation. And the research that we did confirmed that the community was right. Their instinct and knowledge was right. And shareholders -- the stakeholders shared many of the same views on what is affecting ICANN.

So we did that. And as a part of that, I must highlight the strengths, weaknesses, opportunity, and threat process that the Board went through in the numerous sessions we had with the Board members at the full Board to identify these key focus areas, which as you can see from the slide are security, governance, unique identifier system, geopolitics, and financials.

Over to you, Maarten, I think.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Well, thank you. I'll take you through the first of those areas of strategic focus, security. It's clear that the exponential growth in the security issues is challenging the stability to the naming system itself and the root server system, as well as our ability to finance increasing investments that would be required to ensure continued stability. So there's several aspects here. Cybersecurity is on top of the agenda, not only in ICANN but also beyond. And DDOS attacks have really grabbed public headlines across the world in different ways.

IoT as an upcoming, rapidly growing part of our Internet comes with vulnerabilities even if it comes with blessings as well for the users.

Enormous amount of those not always very well-secured as to cybersecurity risks.

And the DNS security itself. I mean, the DNS was never built as we know in this room to do what it does today, to be so important in the critical systems for society.

The second key trend is increasing threats to the root server system itself and the challenges to root servers' reliability, resilience, and interoperability. A key issue, and very much at the core of our mission, we see the increasing threats here and we take that as a very serious one. Also, when you look five years ahead, it's not going to get less. It's going to get more.

And then up and beyond that, there's continuing concerns about DNS abuse itself. DNS can be used for the good but also for the bad, and we should pay attention to that.

So with that, we see some opportunities and challenges for the years ahead. Many of you will be aware of the Root Server System Advisory Committee's advice on action coming up via that committee and with recommendations to work very much on resilience of that. We are looking into that and really look to foster that into future, that resilience. A new proposed governance model, it will be important in that.

I think in general we also concluded that despite the fact we are aware that there's all these increasing security threats, often we are not very

precise in what they are and where they come from and in what way they affect us.

And, therefore, we really look to alliance with other players. We don't need to do this alone either. We just need to make sure that we are diving into that. So the opportunity is even better understanding it and working even better with other players in the community, in the ecosystem.

And last, but not least, fortunately as our CEO said this morning, we don't have to be careful about this statement but there is a heightened importance to address the KSK issues. If you're serious about DNSSEC together, we need to really address that as well. And that's another area.

With that, I'll take it -- Matthew, would you take the next one.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Maarten.

So strategic focus area Number 2, governance. As you have heard from our chair's speech this morning, this issue of the efficiency and effectiveness of the processes, the PDPs and multistakeholder process, as a whole has come to the fore as an issue. And that's very much reflected in this strategic focus area. So it's ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance which grew to fit ICANN's needs, has the potential of becoming less effective and more expensive as it matures and scales up to respond to increasing needs of the community.

And this is really driven by a number of related key themes, and here are three of them. And I think this is a question again that was raised this morning, which is how can we improve on? If the theme is efficiency and effectiveness of the multistakeholder model continue to be questioned, how can we improve on that?

Another key theme was: The continued necessity of fulfilling of transparency and accountability, inclusiveness, and openness obligations. Obviously those are absolutely essential to the multistakeholder model and to its functioning and success. So if there is a concern around that, that should be of primary focus for us.

And then the third theme that came through very clearly was the need to work more effectively, in a more timely fashion, and in a more efficient manner so that we can make the most of ICANN's limited resources.

So a couple of opportunities arise from that. Obviously as we've now, you know, witnessed this morning, an increased focus on the bottom-up decision-making structures, how do we make them more efficient, how do we make them more effective.

We need to improve the clarity -- the role clarity between the community, Board, and Org. And I'll split this into two but the need to increase global diversity and efficacy of participation on the one hand but also the incredibly important concern that we hear over and over again, which is that of addressing volunteer and staff fatigue. So those are the three opportunities and challenges.

Back to you, Maarten.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** Good. We try to get you awake by moving your head from one side to the other.

Strategic focus area Number 3 is the unique identifiers system, which is at the core of what we do. And obviously the rapid evolution of new technologies really requires to be responsive to these changes and ensure that the unique identifiers system evolves and continues to serve the global Internet user base. And in that, there's basically two trends, the main trends: The alternative roots that have always been there. Yet, with different interaction and different players and emphasis, they can also affect the global interoperability of the Internet.

On the other hand, we also see there's new technologies that are not necessarily alternative roots in the same way but really external technology advancement such as blockchain. What blockchain is going to do is not clear. That is here to stay is clear and what role it will play in identifier system is not clear either.

Whereas, if you also see IoT, there may well be -- and there's likely to be combinations. Rise of artificial intelligence is a game changer from which we only see the beginning much more to come.

And these technology advancements are not threats necessarily. They can be opportunities, too. But it's important to keep track. And it's not

about defending what we have at all costs because that's what we have. It's about using -- ensuring there are unique identifiers that serve the global Internet user base.

Now the opportunities and challenges that come from that are, one, increased pressure to improve and promote also the universal acceptance and IDN implementation. If you want the system to follow the new trends and to serve a larger public, these are crucial elements. And we've begun with that. Yet, it's not functioning as much as we -- as broadly and as seamlessly as we would like.

Big challenge for the coming five years.

And again, also here in particular to the enormous fast technology advancement, we need to improve our understanding and responsiveness to these new technologies. So bring you to the next, Matthew, you again.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you, sir. Strategic focus number 4, geopolitics. Now, there's nothing new in this particular issue of geopolitics. We know that this has been an important factor in how ICANN interacts with the external world all along, but it certainly has come to the fore with an increase in outside influences and now a very clear impact from extra territorial pressures that we've seen, for example, through GDPR. So the focus is, the increasing importance of the Internet across all sectors increases the possibility of governments intervening to gain control over the DNS through legislation and regulation. At the same time, there is an

increasing risk of Internet fragmentation as a result of geopolitical, technical, and organizational pressures.

And what's interesting, I'm just going to make a little aside here, you will note as we go through these, the interlinkages to the other focus areas. So clearly what Maarten just described focuses on one aspect, talking about alternative Internet, and now we're talking about a more political side to it but it is effectively the same kind of concern which are these outside pressures.

So what are the key trend themes, more legislation and regulation which risk impacting the Internet's unique identifier systems and ICANN's mission. I think it's probably fair to say that these have come more to the fore, they are more pressing. And this is largely brought about, as noted in the focus itself, by the increasing global reliance on the Internet. And the increasing global geopolitical risks of Internet fragmentation. There have been many mentions over the past couple of years about alternative internets and other such things.

So what does this mean for ICANN? Well, it means that, and I think it goes without saying but it's something we'll need to do more of, that we need a greater need for monitoring of global issues, regulatory or other, and public policy decisions on a global basis. And it also means that there's a continued need for capacity building and I would add education to that, engagement on the one hand, but also alliances building with others in the Internet ecosystem and beyond. So we not only have to look internally as you've seen in some of these other focus areas but we have to look externally. And part of that capacity building

## Input

---

and education is talking about what the DNS is, what ICANN's role is, and continuing to work and in fact building our relationships with the Internet ecosystem and other entities. Back to you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you for not mentioning GDPR. Financials. Strategic area, we almost got away with that, right? This strategic focus area came last, and it was basically because as such it's not about financial, it's about what we do with it, but in all these areas we run into that's nothing of this will work unless we get this right, too. And for that we need to understand where our income comes from and how -- where -- how we can finance that. So we need to understand consolidation in the marketplace that's happening and the continued uncertainty surrounding the expansion of the new gTLD namespace and the gTLD namespace at large, and other factors that are putting pressures on our ability to support the growing needs and demands of our global community. So key trend themes there are -- what we see at the moment is funding stabilizing for the foreseeable future. We don't see big changes coming there. At the same time, we see continued growing of demands and costs, demands for support from stakeholders, demands for investments to address security, technology requirements, the costs of global engagement and the costs of transparency and accountability as well. All those we want to adhere and live up to, but they don't come for free. Financial responsiveness is also important to changing industry economics. What we need to do here that the opportunities are -- well, partly internal also to strengthen

## Input

---

cost management and financial accountability mechanisms. Better know where we spend it on, and we've been working on that for many years but you can always do a little bit better. Opportunities to plan appropriately funded and managed and risk evaluated new round of TLDs is something we will not escape from when the years -- the next five years to come either. What role would that play in this prospect. The necessity of funding to address increasing technology and security requirements is clear. Where do we get that money from if it's not from growing income. And the need for greater understanding, again what we saw with technology, what we see with how the world around us politically and regulatory is developing is also true for industry economics market projections.

So last of the needs there is an increasing productivity in financial planning model. So one of the quick steps, one of the things we want to discuss with you over the coming year is to move from the one year, the year-to-year planning model, to go to a two-year planning model. So a little built further outlook. So with that, I think back to you, Ram.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Maarten. And thank you, Matthew, for walking us through all of these. We have reached the end of our presentation to you, and I'd now like to open this up for discussions. Theresa and I will facilitate. Our panelists here will help us answer questions, and really all of us will engage -- will want to engage in a dialogue with all of you in the room.

## Input

---

Our plan is to spend about 10 minutes per focus area. We have five focus areas. So we're looking for about 10 minutes per focus area. And we're specifically looking for your inputs and your thoughts, and I'd like to structure it the following way: One, did the opportunities and challenges that we have analyzed and we are bringing back to you, do they resonate with you as the right elements to focus on strategically? The second is, what have we missed? What are the missing elements, what should we be thinking of that we didn't, either here or analyze appropriately. You may come to the microphone to speak. For remote participants, please type your comments or questions in the chat and they'll be read out loud by our remote participant manager Charla. So with that said, let's start on the first focus area, security. Please come over to the microphone or submit your questions or your comments in the chat.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thumbs up is okay, too.

THERESA SWINEHART: This might be a very short session.

JOHN LAPRISE: Hello. John Laprise, ALAC representative from NARALO. I've read the RSSAC 37 document. It's fantastic. And very strong. One of the best planning documents I've seen come out of ICANN. And it's going to cause a lot of change and it will have some big costs incurred with it. I

Input

---

don't know where that's coming from, but at least from my perspective it's something that needs to happen. So I fully support RSSAC 37 and I think it's a great first stab at a plan for the future.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, John. Other comments, questions.

RON DA SILVA:

Ron da Silva, ICANN board. I can't help but respond to John's implied comment or concern which is, how do we pay for it. So certainly there's another component to the five-year strategic plan and it's the five-year operating plan and five-year economic plan on how we're going to achieve those goals. So that's forthcoming, also a work in progress. But in parallel to this -- to this effort.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Ron.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI:

Dirk Krischenowski from .BERLIN for the record. As ICANN, with the precedent of the GDPR case identified areas where the ICANN contract, the Registry Agreement and registrar contracts have checked in which areas they could be in conflict with national laws like, let's say the ICANN fees every registry has to pay. Is this in line with European competition laws or the need for accreditation of only ICANN registrars? If you look at .EU, they can have just every registrar in the EU accredited

Input

---

and we as Berlin need only to rely on ICANN accredited registrars. And I think that could be a potential conflict in the next time coming.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Dirk. Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: I think you flag an area that certainly was identified in the strategic outlook related discussions and that is the emergence of not only at the global level, either treaties or other initiatives that could have an impact on ICANN's remit but also the regional or national levels. And in looking at the strategic planning process, making sure that as we're looking at the multistakeholder model and the governance structure, it's prepared also to be aware of those and address those in the appropriate ways, if they have an impact on ICANN's remit. So from a strategic planning process and a preparation for a strategic plan, that certainly is an element that's captured in what we presented, and then the details about how one gets to that would be dealt with in the operating plan or other plans. So you've, at a high level, touched on what we have to actually figure out how to address on the day-to-day actions. So --

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: I'm just curious -- dirk Krischenowski from .BERLIN. I'm just curious, we didn't have a case like GDPR before and now we have it, and it could have a lot of impact. Okay. Thank you.

Input

---

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. And as Matthew was saying earlier, Dirk, the -- the reality is that there have always been jurisdictions and regulations and rules and things like that, but I think what we're reflecting back to you is that as an organization, certainly as a board and in the community, but as an organization and as a board, we need to be cognizant of these changes and understand what the impact might be on the various things that we're doing, including on the contractual obligations.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: As there's not a long line behind the microphone so I'd like to add a little bit here. Before we came here, I was with a couple of colleagues at the RIPE NCC meeting in Amsterdam and, in fact, what they did was also have a session in which they just fed back, said what's happening regulatory, just to make sure and to complement Ram as well, the fact that if we pay more attention to it and have become aware that we really need to have a radar for that doesn't take away the responsibility of everybody in this community to follow up and contribute with that. So because of the increasing importance of the Internet and what we do, the pressure of this will -- both politically and regulatory will take up as well. It's just a fact of life and we will need to deal with it, and we look forward to finding a way forward together.

RAM MOHAN: Charla, any questions online? No? Okay. Perhaps what we could do is cycle through to each of the trends and we can come back so it might -

Input

---

- the conversations might, you know, evolve in your own minds and you might have questions coming up. Let's go to the -- to the next strategic focus area, governance. Comments and questions, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'll take the smaller one of the two. On my tiptoes otherwise. Good afternoon. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I currently serve as the ALAC's liaison to the GNSO council, but I'm speaking absolutely from a personal capacity here.

Not so much anything I would suggest is a missing element but this is one of the few bits that give me pause on one word. And I guess it's not just the word, but it's the fact that it's coupled in the way that it is. I did go through a number of these processes that we did in our small group work. I've heard what you've analyzed quite correctly. I'm not disputing at all that the concern of effectiveness and efficiency was coupled with this issue as well as with expense and, of course, finance goes across it all. But I would posit that with a intelligent approach and effective planning, even with the risk of additional expenditure, particularly if we're going to be professional about it, does not necessarily mean that we're going to get less effective linked with more expensive. I think this is one of those points where if we do work smarter, we will, in fact, get greater effectiveness and not having a difference in the cost, just of the benefit. So I'm just -- this is the one point that I am a little uncomfortable about, the linkage of it being less effective and more expensive. I think there's more opportunities here than risks. Thank you.

Input

---

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Cheryl. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah, Cheryl, that's a great point, and thank you for raising it. I don't think we're trying to imply what you're suggesting. I think what we're recognizing is that any further efficiencies will and can bring that. But I think what we're hoping here is that the combination between looking at increasing efficiency, looking at increasing effectiveness will actually help in terms of reducing costs rather than contributing to them. So yes, smart is a key word. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Stand up (indiscernible) . Jordan Carter, .NZ. This is a governance-related question which isn't really related to the opportunities and challenges. These are five areas of strategic focus. And, you know, we're a biggish organization now with a few hundred staff but you still need to choose which one's most important. Is the kind of balance of effort across these areas going to be determined by the five-year planning process rather than in the strategy, or are you planning to develop a hierarchy of these five strategic focus areas within the strategic plan?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Jordan. The feedback that we received from the community is that each of these five areas is actually quite important

## Input

---

and losing focus on any of them will likely render them urgent. And therefore the -- the advice and the input from the community and -- and our own analysis is that we really can't pick one of these and -- and say that that is the most important priority and to some extent downgrade the others.

Now, on a year-to-year basis, we -- in the -- in the costing and in the financial plan that we were speaking to, we intend to make some allocations across each of these five areas and to report back to you as to what is happening there. Now, some -- sometimes, you know, our community members look at the amount of money spent as a proxy for the amount of importance for a given area. And what we're trying to do here is to actually change that model to say, all of these are actually important and money not being spent, for example, on security in the 2021 fiscal year doesn't mean that security is not an important strategic focus area. I hope that answers your question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Hello, everyone. This is Mark (saying name) from the business constituency. I spent most of last two years doing local engagement together with our regional manager, Daniel Fink, in Brazil. I think one thing that comes out of this experience very strongly is that often when we're doing engagement -- I'm addressing the diversity point here -- we're starting from point zero. ICANN Org, while the community does a lot of outreach and tries to explain from ICANN Org itself, there's very little presence. There's very little -- I wouldn't call it marketing but it's not very forward facing. It doesn't communicate and it's very much left

Input

---

to the community. And it's fine. We would like to do it. The problem is that every new space you go to, even spaces that you would expect, there would be no ISP providers -- ISPs. And all of this for a where there is the expectation somebody from ICANN would have reached out in some way to get a seminary to just reach out with a brochure, that doesn't happen.

So the problem is, we feel like we are trying to increase diversity. It's a very underserved region in particular in terms of business, but we are always starting from step zero. So moving forward to have just a little bit more engagement from the Org, I believe it would be very helpful from those doing the one-on-one engagements. That's more of a comment than a question. But thank you.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you. Maarten, perhaps Theresa and Matthew if you would like to comment as well.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you for that. What is well-understood -- this was explained also in strategic area 4 and on the global governance issue -- is that it's important that it's well-understood what's happening in this. And, yes, many of you are doing your outreach in your regions, with our politicians, with your regulators, with your businesses. And that should continue. And time to time, you will find us, Org, Board members, whatever, on your side in that. We are not leading that, but we are

## Input

---

seeking in this specifically to work with others and to be present where we need to be.

We tried to be selective in that, too, because we want to stay close to our mission. We don't want to waste the community's money, so we are selective in that. But for sure, opportunities arise. And the current impression that comes forward from the analysis so far is that we will need to step up this and make sure that it's well understood, to make sure when countries, for instance, come to regulations, that they're aware of this, at multilateral and global level for sure; that they would expect to see ICANN as their counterpart to help preventing unintended consequences, to be informed, not as a political player but as a factual coordinator that can speak on behalf of the identifier industry.

Anything in addition to that?

THERESA SWINEHART:

This is another really good example of where the cadence of the work and the prioritization of the work or maybe the emphasis in different areas can be reflected in the operating plan and it being a five-year operating plan but then obviously on an annual basis looking at it, the perfect place to take a look at that. So we have the high-level concept in the strategic plan and then how we execute and operationalize it is there. So thank you for flagging that.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, my name is Sandra Hoferichter. I'm connected with the European At-Large community. And I'm the organizer of EuroDIG, the European IGF, and the European Summer School on Internet Governance. And these are actually -- it's the background what I want to contribute here.

I very much support this strategic focus area on Internet governance, and maybe it's worth adding that ICANN should keep on all efforts in supporting national, regional, and the global Internet Governance Forum as a sort of keeping the Internet governance environment clean and friendly which also provides a safe environment for ICANN itself.

I'm not so sure if ICANN should engage more in setting up or initiating national and regional initiatives. I think that goes too far. I also do not think that ICANN should organize schools on Internet governance itself. But it should continue to support those initiatives because ICANN and the multistakeholder model of ICANN plays a very big role in those discussions. It's the unique multistakeholder model that we are carrying in front of us, and we really need ICANN's multistakeholder model to function in order to carry on with this Internet governance areas and initiatives that are growing more and more around the world. And ICANN is part of it.

It's the microcosmos within the microcosmos. And I would really encourage ICANN to maybe even add this under opportunities as a certain element. Thank you.

Input

---

RAM MOHAN: Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes. Thank you. Thank you for that. I think there is a growing recognition of the importance of education, capacity-building, and other initiatives. And I think that those are two examples you gave of excellent institutions and processes that ICANN should continue to support and continue to be engaged in.

I think we have -- we've identified it in these focus areas. It's kind of a common theme, which is that, you know, looking at what -- talking about what ICANN does, what its mission is, you know, what the DNS is, how important a single interoperable global Internet is, all of these things are part of what we need to talk about and not least of which is the multistakeholder model, as you highlighted. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Thank you very much for that. We really appreciate and personally I'm an admirer of the work you do with the EuroDIG and the summer school in Europe. It's a clear example of how new people get built in, capacity-building, crucial element, vital understanding, super.

We do not see ourselves as a convener of regional IGFs, but it does not mean we're not interested. And for sure, as you know, you have seen me many times and other colleagues as well. We interact very much as

Input

---

a supporter. Sometimes even help in other ways. And very important this goes on.

So thank you very much, Sandra, for everything you do and appreciate it. I'll continue to support that personally. And I'm sure ICANN as an institution is willing to continue to support you in other ways as well.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you. John.

JOHN LAPRISE:

John Laprise, ALAC. It's fortunate that I speak after Sandra because I want to riff off of her and also make your third bullet up there a little bit harder.

So earlier this week Sally Costerton came and spoke with us at ALAC. And one of the points we raised with her is that unlike many SO/ACs, the people who come to volunteer with ALAC and At-large more generally lack even in some cases basic sort of like how do administrative organizations function, basic meeting etiquette, all the tools that we in other SOs and ACs people generally come to the table with. Because we are reaching to members at-large, we have a higher lift in addition to the language barrier that we often face.

So when you're considering diversity and efficacy of participation, I'd ask that you'd also consider the additional training that needs to happen to incorporate people who don't have this experience with international organizations, global conference call management, all

Input

---

these kinds of things so that they can participate effectively in ICANN.  
Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Did you want to respond, Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, John. And completely agree.

And I think ICANN has a number of programs for bringing people on board, as we all know.

But I think your point about understanding how these structures operate and how to engage in them is a very important one.

And I just wanted to come back on what we were talking about just before that, I think that the importance of the multistakeholder model is not just ICANN's responsibility in terms of engagement and education. It's actually an Internet ecosystem responsibility. So I think that's an important point to make clear, that we do have a communal interest and role in promoting the multistakeholder model. And ICANN has a specific role in promoting the ICANN model and how it operates and how one engages in it, et cetera. Thanks.

HELEN McDONALD: Hi. I'm Helen McDonald from the Canadian Internet Registration Authority, and I appreciate the challenges of putting strategic plans together. We're in a similar circumstance.

## Input

---

But much of what I have been reading and hearing today is focusing on have we got the right things but what are we missing. What else do we need to add to this?

I'm presuming that when you come to try and settle against your funding available -- and I do congratulate you on a five-year costing model -- how do you come to those kinds of determinations? Is part of the process that you've been undergoing also identifying efficiencies or lower-priority items that might help in that tough resolution that will be coming up? Thank you.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Helen. I am actually going to call on Ron da Silva who is on the board and also is the chair of the Finance Committee to perhaps provide a response.

RON DA SILVA:

That's a great question. Certainly there's a need to prioritize and reconcile a large trough of activities that I think us as a community would like to do. And, obviously, we have a fixed amount of resources in order to execute against that. So we will need to prioritize things.

And that iterative process of identifying what goes into the operating plan is going to be just like this, an engagement activity with the communities so we can collectively look at what are our capabilities here, here are the resources we have, and here are the things we're going to prioritize accordingly.

## Input

---

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you. I see there are no comments in the online section.

So let's move to the third area, the unique identifiers system. Open up for questions and comments.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Good afternoon. My name is Peter Van Roste. I'm the general manager of CENTR, European ccTLDs. Thank you for this presentation and for the whole exercise that took place in order to get to this point. This is an exercise that CENTR members, individual and as a community, have gone through in the last couple of years as well. And it's nice to see there's quite a bit of overlap.

For this one, I think we typically identified it as something broader, more about the relevance of the DNS, of the naming system as we know it today, so not just as a technical challenge with reference to blockchain, IoT, and artificial intelligence. There is lots of other competition out there to the DNS. And making sure the DNS remains relevant is from quite of my members one of their strategic priorities. So just wanted to share that this goal could probably be defined slightly broader than it is. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you for that. This is Ram.

Input

---

I just wanted to point out that in our discussions and in our analysis, we heard similar things. There are new technologies that are coming up and there is continuous evolution, some of which might be disruptive to the system that we know. And that is really what we intended to cover by the second bullet there.

The realization was that so far the current model seems to -- the realization of the current model is that ICANN is reactive to the presence and the understanding of new technologies. We really want to change that model to be responsive so -- and the change from reactive to responsive means that you identify, you try and understand, perhaps conduct a few experiments, engage in all of those areas that you mentioned and potentially other areas as well.

We've had discussions on the Board and with ICANN Org, for example, about the proposed handshake model that is out there on the Internet, for example. But we didn't want to specify just blockchain or IoT because that is relevant today but may not be so relevant in three years' time. May be "it" in three years' time as well. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Sorry, if I may, I think that's an excellent point. And I think what Ram just mentioned is also something we're recognizing across the Board here, which is -- and as I mentioned in the geopolitics one, is that we have to be far more aware of what's happening in the broader landscape, whether it's technological, whether it's regulatory and be

Input

---

able to anticipate and understand what the implications may be. So thank you for that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Peter, I may be preempting you, but next to new technologies test, of course, is also use of Google and apps which changes the value of domain names. I thought that was mature also. True, that changes the way people are looking for websites. At the same time, these Google and apps and maybe future technologies like met, et cetera, they will rely on websites where information is provided and these website domain names will be chosen with care. It is what we believe to be true at the moment. So that's why it's not at the same level of the universal acceptance in the IDN. The newer technologies, they take away the need for people to know domain names but they don't take away the need for domain names as such. Does that make sense?

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Peter Van Roste again from CENTR. Yes, indeed, that does make sense, of course but I believe it's broader than that. It's not just the way in which people use the DNS to get to the content. It's probably more importantly affecting the bottom line the way people choose their identifier. And there is now plenty of other options from social media. If a sandwich bar opts first to open a Facebook page rather than register a domain name, that is going to affect the way ICANN is operating and that numbers are going to predict their future growth and their future operations.

Input

---

I'm missing that part, the nontechnological part in the strategic 4 focus area. That's why I meant I think it's a little broader. This is an important part of it, but it's not just that. It's the alternatives for identifiers.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you very much. We'll be happy to take that on Board and perhaps adapt that as an extra bullet point. Thank you, sir, for that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

This is Mark (saying name), business constituency. So I believe we finish what is the first IDN acceptance study in Latin America. We are presenting the results in one hour in the LAC Space. And this pointed out something to us that is a certain lack of cooperation when it comes to IDN. For example, one of the key problems we identified with IDN acceptance is a lack of compliance on the HML5 standard. The form that -- in its email when defined as an email form does not process IDNs at a certain level. So this points to us that it's -- it shouldn't be that way. It should be that if there are bodies that work on this, there's a W3C, the browser developers are working -- they are working members of ICANN in different working groups. So how come we have the IDN standard but HML5, which is supposed to be the language we are all working on as a compliant language does not support IDNs at all level.

So this is kind of problem is what I see a lack of better integration between the different bodies. And it's not something that I find trivial because for us to fix at our end is much more difficult than for it to be

## Input

---

fixed at an institutional level by high-level members cooperating with each other.

So when I look at this, yes, I believe that's true. But there are underlying issues there I think run a little bit deeper than that.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you. This is Ram.

I think in general, there's a lot of resonance with what you're saying. And also clearly defined need to not only have engagement but to have a model for that to be sustained. So it's not just on an issue-by-issue basis, which is today the model that seems to exist. And I think there's a realization that there are many such organizations that in general have the same long-term end goal about the Internet ecosystem, et cetera.

We have a clearly focused remit.

But there are opportunities for engagement and there's a realization that has to be done in a sustained, consistent manner with maybe some framework underneath it. But thank you for that input.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Just Cyrus, you've been involved in this. Can you add to this? Thank you.

## Input

---

**CYRUS NAMAZI:** Thank you very much. This is Cyrus Namazi with ICANN org. I think Ram actually did provide a very comprehensive response, and one of the avenues that I suggest maybe we can take this conversation to would be perhaps in the Universal Acceptance Steering Group which has a community update session tomorrow. This is a program -- in case you don't know -- that actually is run by the community but funded and supported by ICANN, quite tremendously actually. And we can make this actually, if it's not in their work track, and Ram might actually be able to help with this, I think it is, we can definitely give it a level of attention that it needs. I'm happy to follow up with you on this site here on that.

**RAM MOHAN:** Thank you, Cyrus.

**DONNA AUSTIN:** Thanks, Ram. Donna Austin from Neustar but also from the registry stakeholder group. I just want to follow up on Peter's point. One of the things that contracted parties has actually raised with the board on a number of occasions is that we understand the concept of, you know, universal acceptance and IDN implementation but one of the things we have struggled with is the universal awareness of new gTLDs. The argument has always been that ICANN can't be seen to promote one TLD over another, but I think if you think about it from a -- a public awareness campaign, ICANN does have an obligation to ensure that the global community understands that there are more choices available.

## Input

---

And it also goes to the point that they are -- you know, they are safe places to go. So I -- you know, I am aware of people that don't understand that, you know, if you go to .CLUB, it's not -- or if you get mail -- email from a .CLUB, for example, email address that it is a valid address, that it is a valid extension. So I wonder if, you know, in terms of what's missing here whether there's an opportunity to think about whether a universal awareness point could be added here for, you know, new domains because I think there is a need for it. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Donna. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thank you, Donna. I think this goes back to the point Peter made as well. One thing is to make sure it works. The other way is to make sure it's -- people are aware it's part of making this system work. So looking forward very much on how this is going to develop. People don't always know that it may be a problem if you have a non-traditional web name and what to do about it, both things. So appreciate the point.

THERESA SWINEHART: So just one thing to add on this, I know it's come up in the universal acceptance area but it oftentimes also comes up with IPv6 and in other areas around new technologies, and so there may be an opportunity to capture some language that looks at this but then figure out in the

## Input

---

operating plan what the right approach would be and what's appropriate for ICANN to be doing that the community wants to be done and what resources should be put there because it seems that there's -- there's a range of technological developments and we're probably not at the end of seeing what we're going to see in the future that could be captured in some kind of way that would be appropriate and the community agrees to.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Theresa. Other comments, questions? Okay. Let's go to focus area number 4, geopolitics. Questions and comments.

BILL GRAHAM: Hi. Bill Graham, former board member. I wasn't sure whether to bring this up in the last one or in this one, but there's continuing talk about alternate routes and the possibility of these emerging in a political context, including the politics of current trade problems going on between major powers, and I think it's really important for ICANN to look at the possibility of the emergence of other alternate routes for political reasons and if there's a way to either incorporate that into the single route or the single interoperability of the Internet or to, in some way, try to avoid this happening. I just think that's going to be an increasing issue for the future. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Bill. Matthew.

Input

---

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Bill, thanks very much. This has been an issue that the board has spent some time on and very aware of these challenges. I think we have -- you know, it's a multi-onset of that. I mean, part of it is a very basic kind of education that we were talking about earlier on, the importance of a single interoperable Internet on what -- what ICANN's role is and things like that. But it's also about understanding where there's -- what's the genesis for those asks and those -- what those countries seeking to do. And I think, you know, a lot of those are couched in cybersecurity terms, for example, and so I think we need to understand where they're coming from, what their potential impact may be, but I think we also have to be cognizant of the -- sometimes it comes with a lot of geopolitical overtones. So the intent may not be as obvious as what's being said, but we are focused very much on that.

MARITA MOLL:

Hi. I'm Marita Moll, incoming NARALO chair with the ALAC council. On the issue of continued need for capacity building, engagement, and alliances, sometimes I have heard questions about whether or not ICANN should be very deeply involved in Internet governance. Other bodies suggest that's a bit of mission creep. I don't myself believe that at all. I think it's absolutely essential that ICANN is there at the table with all those other parties. But I think there's a -- a little piece missing there, and that has come up in some of our discussions about who -- who, how, when, and where should -- you know, how should those discussions go on, with whom, and who's going to feed back into ICANN

## Input

---

and what are they saying in those fora. So it's a little piece that still belongs in there that I think kind of needs to be considered in that part. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, thanks. That's a very timely question because as you -- as you may be aware, there's a discussion underway in ICANN about how the community engages on Internet governance. It's around a Cross-Community Working Group On Internet Governance. But more broadly, it is also a question that's one of the priorities for the board and one of our priorities is to actually sit down and do exactly what you've just described, which is work with the organization and understand what the criteria are for engaging, with whom we should engage, recognizing as you've seen through these slides that there's a growing awareness that we do need to be more aware and we do need to know what's going on in the -- in the regulatory issues around the globe. So I think it's a question that will probably always linger, but I think there's a recognition that we do need to be more aware of what's going on. And I would say it's not just the Internet governance space but it's actually more broadly the Internet policy space. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Other comments or questions on area 4.

Input

---

ROELOF MEIJER:

Thank you, Ram. My name is Roelof Meijer. I'm with SIDN, the registry of .NL, the Dutch country code. First of all, compliments for the highlights so far. I think it's been a good process and a very good outcome.

With regard to this point, I find it a bit defensive in the sense that are we also going to address the cause why certain countries and the countries that subscribe to the multistakeholder model still want to have more influence on the Internet and our daily business because they think that there are things happening which should not been happening. For instance, in my own ccTLD we try to take actions to make this ccTLD as safe and clean of illegal things as possible, and I'm not suggesting that ICANN should become the content police, but I think separate from those countries that do not subscribe to the multistakeholder model, there -- there should be something that we do to satisfy legitimate needs that countries that do subscribe to the model see. Because I think that will already deal with a lot of legislation -- legislation or regulation initiatives if we take some actions from our side. And the outcome will be better if we do nothing and wait for something to happen. I think the whole GDPR thing is a good example of that.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Roelof. I'm understanding what you're saying, and I'm actually going to see if I can get David Conrad, who was just about to move to his next session, to perhaps come up to the microphone and

## Input

---

share a little bit about the ICANN efforts, the ICANN org efforts on the DAR project, the domain anti-abuse, the research and the work that has been going on there. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD:

Just as I was walking out the door. So work on DAR is continuing. We're planning on publishing a statistical report showing the amount of domain name abuse that we're able to see from the various reputation providers. It doesn't say anything about the cause of that abuse. It's simply reporting the quantity of abuse as reported in to reputation providers of various forms. Things like phishing. Phishing, what is it? Phishing, malware, botnet command and control, and spam. So the information there we're hoping will provide data to the community that will allow the community to get a better handle on the implications of their policies in terms of how that affects the DNS abuse.

Beyond that, we're planning on providing to the contracted parties a way of obtaining information about the abuse that's impacting -- that we see that's impacting the TLDs that they're responsible for. Again, hoping to provide -- allow them to have additional information that will enable them to address that abuse more effectively.

AJAY DATA:

Can I hold you for a second, David? Thank you. You just spoke about spam. In that regard the point is the reason I came up. And I've been thinking the last few ICANNs that spam is not dealt here.

Input

---

RAM MOHAN: Sorry. If you could, please, identify yourself.

AJAY DATA: Sorry, Ajay Data. I work under Ram's leadership in UASG and now nominated by NomCom in ccNSO. So I have been hearing about -- not hearing about spam and we know that spam is one problem which is continuously increasing. And actually it is really a concern for a stable Internet. It can actually make the Internet down. And especially those new gTLDs which are maybe attacked or maybe generating spam, there is no policy around and there is no group which is discussing here. I raised one or two points here, but I was told that spam is actually not part of the point which you are trying to make so that's the reason I got up. They told us three points, malware and DDoS attack and one more thing, but not spam. So I'm just curious that if we can -- if spam is there, I am happy. If it is not, can we add it?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. David, did you want to respond?

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, sure. In terms of providing information to the community, we include spam because it is probably the primary vector by which other mechanisms of DNS abuse are actually implemented. So in and of itself, you know, one can argue whether or not it's content or infrastructure abuse, but in and of itself, it isn't sort of the key indicator.

Input

---

It's actually a correlate to other types of abuse. So we include that as information for the community in order to help promote discussions in ways to combat that type of abuse.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

AJAY DATA: Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: It's time to move to our -- the fifth focus area, financials. Invite comments.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm not coming to the mic to comment.

[ Laughter ]

I have no comment.

MATTHEW SHEARS: We need some comments because we have got Xavier right here.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Roelof, do you want to have a conversation with me?

Input

---

ROELOF MEIJER: No, in private.

OSCAR ROBLES: Hi. Oscar Robles. Two couple of -- one couple of comments. Two comments. One related specifically to the financials. And I think that you should include -- my suggestion is that you should include a political review of the assumptions that you made in order to create this strategic plan. I think that in case something fails on the market trends or on the domain name registrations you must adjust as soon as possible. Otherwise, it will create a greater financial effect.

The second one is more general, that the -- from your initial opportunities it seems that you're looking for efficiency, which is good. But efficiency starts at the strategic planning process. If you finish the strategic plan, then you will start looking for efficiency, that's too late. You have to keep a focus on your strategic planning in order to reach those efficiencies, otherwise, as I said, it will be too late. Thank you very much.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much, Oscar. This is Ram. I just want to make just a couple of comments on this. So this year the board -- as Matthew said earlier, this year the board created a caucus group. And the way the caucus groups -- they are somewhat ephemeral. They form for a particular issue and then when it's done, they dissolve. But what became apparent for us was exactly what you were saying which is the need to constantly evaluate the assumptions that were being made,

## Input

---

ensure that the input that the strategic plan and the general direction that we're going to make sure that that actually ties with the reality and the dynamism of the marketplace, of the regulatory environment, et cetera, that's going on. So as a result of that, the -- what the board has done is it has changed from a caucus group model to actually create a - - a working group that is a standing group inside of the board itself, to have a continued focus and continued oversight in that area. And in fact, I led the -- the caucus group this year, but I step off the board and Maarten and Matthew are actually going to be helping drive that continued focus going forward. So the points are taken onboard and, you know, we'll continue to reflect that as we move forward. Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Ram. And just in addition to what Ram just said, we all absolutely agree with your comment for sure. From a methodology standpoint, a strategic plan should always be living and updated whenever necessary. You don't want a static plan for a period of five years, which is the period for ours, you want to be able to review the assumptions that are underlying to your strategic plan and adjust them as the environment changes. Another illustration of that, and you mentioned the potential change in the DNS market, for example, this is one of the risks that is associated to the strategic plan that is also the subject of ongoing monitoring so that we are able to react as soon as any trend as such is identified and adjust our strategy accordingly. So strategic planning should be a flexible exercise, even if it's done for a -- a long period. It shouldn't be a fixed and frozen document. Thank you.

Input

---

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Any other comments? Okay.

This concludes our Q&A session. Thank you for all of the inputs and the constructive feedback. Let me hand it over to you, Theresa, to speak about the next steps.

THERESA SWINEHART: Sure. Thank you. And thanks, everybody. I know that this was sort of a long day already. So this has been very good.

So where we are is obviously right now we're in the discussions with the community and the development of the draft strategic plan.

Our goal is working with the Board to prepare a draft based on input from these discussions, to put it out for public comment in the November/December time frame.

The exact dates we'll announce as soon as we can and put it out for the public comment. We're very cognizant that there are a range of holidays that we need to factor into this, and we'll certainly be taking that into consideration as we figure out the exact dates for the public comment period.

During the January/February time frame, the ICANN Org and the Board will look at the revisions incorporating the public comment into that and, also, make an assessment whether an additional public comment cycle should proceed or not. So that will be very much part of the

Input

---

assessment and then also what the next steps there would be on timing.

The goal would be to have a strategic plan that reflects the community input and agreement adopted by the Board in the March to May 2019 time frame. If we could manage that, then Xavier will be very happy with me. If not, then I'll need your help.

So that is the current time line. And we look forward to getting the input and the discussions. And thank you again for this.

RAM MOHAN:

Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Theresa. Donna Austin. Just a question on the next steps. So there isn't going to be -- well, there might be additional community consultation, if necessary. But I wonder if it's possible to plan for the Kobe meeting -- is that in March -- to have a dedicated session where the community can actually come together and have a discussion around the strategic plan before it goes to the Board for adoption. I really think it would be valuable. This is -- this is the only time. Face-to-face is much better than just doing it through a, you know, public comment period. And in terms of planning, we can -- as we do the scheduling for the Kobe meeting, the people involved in that can actually make sure that there's a chunk of time dedicated to that and

Input

---

we try to make it a nonconflicted session. Because I think it's -- it's a five-year plan, is it? I think it's really important that we do that. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Donna, thanks. I think that's an excellent idea. So we need to get that somehow on the schedule which I think falls to the SO/AC chairs. Thanks very much.

THERESA SWINEHART: So I'm handing it back to Ram now.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much. I'd like to -- since we have just perhaps a minute or so, I'd like to invite all of you in the community, if you have any feedback to us on this strategic planning process, what we have done, what we're doing, whether there are aspects that you'd like to see the Board and ICANN Org do more of and if there are aspects that you'd like to see us improve. So if you have comments, we have perhaps a moment or so to entertain them at this point.

JORG SCHWEIGER: Jorg Schweiger with DENIC. Why not? Probably basically now because my comment doesn't seem to fit to all of the mentioned focal points.

## Input

---

And something I wanted to make a remark on was that now we've been talking about the "what," what we are focusing on. And I think it's very, very important to mention the fact on how we're doing it. And I wish that we could find the rigor to really move on those focal points. And I think that is really crucial because we do have limited resources and we could just not accommodate all community input and everyone's need. So we certainly need some rigor to put decisions forward. And I'm really looking forward to see rigor in decision-making and taking. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. That really touches on the next phase after the strategic plan but already starting that conversation and having an operating plan that really focuses in on the "how" and do that in a way that could be very well-delivered on. So thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Ram, this is directly to you and Maarten actually because you understand IDN more than anybody else. Do you think that icann.org need to adopt IDNs? We need to walk the talk, and we need to have a strategy around how do we have IDNs and how do we have them enabled on icann.org?

I thought I would raise it in the public forum but I thought it was a strategy which is getting recorded. So a strategic decision which ICANN should take. How do you move on -- adding icann.org to the IDNs of icann.org and especially those languages which are already there. You are not more than a week's time to actually will enable them. But to

Input

---

make a big announcement if we were to go away with those strategic decisions. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you very much. I'll make a point of ensuring that Goran hears about the suggestion and the folks on the Board as well. Thank you so much.

I'd like to thank the panelists and all of you here in Barcelona as well as those of you remote for your participation. We will have more of this and the next time around, I'll be sitting on the same side as the rest of the community. I look forward to that. Thank you for all of your participation and continued engagement. This session is adjourned.

[ Applause ]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

We look forward to seeing you behind the microphone, Ram. Thankful for all your stewardship. Very deeply appreciate it. We'll miss you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**