

Firstly as a long-time active ICANN participant and reader of a long history of Operating and Financial Plans, let me note my gratitude and appreciation for the continued improvements in the accessibility of information/data and general readability over the last few years and specifically complement this current document which in my view allows for several 'levels' of reader enquiry into the important material and data contained within, in particular, improved cross-referencing and the use of 5 year and 1-year details.

Secondly, I also note the overall conservative yet well-considered nature of the planned expenditure, from modest growth predictions, for these operational and strategic activities overall, (a reflection of course of the highly professional work of the team involved with the Plans development and production, however concerning Budget Contingency provision, specifically for New gTLD Subsequent Procedures policy development process • Specific and Organizational Reviews • Policy development and compliance required by the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation • Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2, all of which I admit I have a keen interest or involvement with, does give me slight I hope unfounded concern, that it may be too conservative and risk some diminution of possible progress or commitment to these activities as they come into play quite possible as processes and projects that overlap in time. Perhaps consideration or a higher provision percentage and then not exceeding expenditure being seen as good fiscal management would be a preferred approach, on these key/critical matters. This would have the added benefit of not risking as likely the need to as was required previously to 'dip into the Reserve Funds to complete time-critical ICANN/Community activities.

Regarding the Annexed Document "Evolving ICANN's Multistakeholder Model Work Plan:" my brief responses to the specific questions posed follow:

1. Are the right entities suggested to take the lead in developing an approach or solution to an identified issue? If not, which entity would be appropriate?
 - Yes, I believe they are, providing that each sees themselves as the convenor or prime facilitator of an ICANN Community-wide interactive process, that engages the ICANN.Org and relevant staff support..
2. How can the ICANN community effectively coordinate the work of developing approaches and solutions?
 - Communication and opportunity for equitable input and interaction (a mix of Face to Face and intercessional work) will be key to this if it is going to be effective or successful within the ICANN-MSM model. Change is always resisted by some in any situation and experienced facilitators or change agents might also be a useful tool to deploy in various stage of these processes.
3. How should the six issues included in the work plan be prioritized?
 - As one of the Co-Chairs of ATRT3 that is going to make recommendations regarding prioritisation of Key ICANN Activities and Review Team/ CCWG etc., Recommendations to date, I would recommend that specifics of that proposal are applied to these six issues being triaged (sorted in order of action) But my personal view of matters to be addressed would be:-
 - i. 1st ICANN deal with #6 the delegation of Roles and Responsibilities, (ensuring wider ICANN Community 'buy-in');
 - ii. 2nd #5 Precision Scoping (now that GNSO Council has Resolved adoption of PDP 3.0) it is essential to establish with the wider ICANN Community what their opinions/acceptance/reactions to the details of PDP3.0 is across

the ACSOs, but also but the most fragile of many of our process plans in ICANN seems to me to be a problem with proper scoping of planned activities. It could be effective and efficient to also deal with #4 Complexity as an issue in parallel with the mater of Scoping.

- iii. 3rd #1 Consensus, Representatives and Inclusivity, may to some extent be a product of the success (or not) of the other Community interactions relating to the identified Issues. But this could be addressed in parallel to others identified.
- iv. #2 Prioritisation and Effective Use of Resources and #4 Culture Trust and Silos could be addressed as Overarching issues throughout a process that ques the other matter.