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| **ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update** |
| **Publication Date:** | 24 April 2018 |
| **Prepared By:** | Becky Nash |
|  |  |
| **Staff Contact:** | Becky Nash | **Email:** | planning@icann.org |
| **Section I: General Overview and Next Steps** |
| ICANN organization’s (ICANN org) strategic plan for Fiscal Years 2016-2020 was developed through acommunity-led process and adopted by ICANN’s Board in October 2014. The strategic plan underpins ICANN’s Five-Year Operating Plan, which was developed with community input and includes strategic goals with corresponding key performance indicators, dependencies, five-year phasing, and list of portfolios; and a five-year financial model. The initial FY16-20 Five-Year Operating Plan was adopted in April 2016. It is updated each year to reflect what has been achieved and to refine planning forfuture years. The Five-Year Operating Plan is accompanied by a Fiscal-Year Operating Plan & Budget for the coming fiscal year.ICANN published the FY19 draft update to its Five-Year Operating Plan, along with the draft FY19Operating Plan & Budget set of documents on 19 January 2018. The documents were supported by a budget. Webinars with the community were held on 25 and 26 January 2018 at the start of a 49-day public comment period.During the public comment period, ICANN provided responses to clarifying questions from the community. The questions and responses were posted to the public comment forum on 13 February2018.Comments were received from 20 community groups and 19 individuals. The comments were segmented by 18 themes and totaled 184 specific comments. There were 19 comments submitted after the deadline for submitting public comments. We have listed these comments in a section at the end of report. For these comments, where the themes were similar to other comments received we referred to those responses.Following the public comment period, ICANN org held two sessions at ICANN61 with the community to improve understanding of the comments. These sessions helped ICANN org develop better responses and identify changes to make to the draft plans. |

|  |
| --- |
| The updated Five-Year Operating Plan and FY19 Operating Plan and Budget will be presented to theICANN Board for adoption at a Board meeting in May 2018.All amounts referenced below are in U.S. dollars unless otherwise stated. All references to consideration of changes to the FY19 Operating Plan and Budget are suggested changes and subject to approval by the Board.ICANN uses the comments and other feedback provided on the draft planning documents each year to identify areas of strength and areas where improvements are needed. The comments are used to identify specific changes to the planning process the following year. This is a part of ICANN’s commitment to continuous improvement. |
| **Section II: Contributors** |
| *At the time this report was prepared, a total of 20 community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in alphabetical order. 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** |  |
| At-Large Advisory Committee | Alan Greenberg | ALAC |
| Blacknight, an Irish based hosting provider | Michele Neylon | Blacknight |
| Country Code Names SupportingOrganization – Strategic and OperationalPlanning Committee | Giovanni Seppia | ccNSO-SOPC |
| CEO of Registry Africa | Shantall Ramatsui on behalf ofMr. Lucky Madiela | Registry Africa |
| CEO, Allegravita LLC | Simon Couisin | CEO, AllegravitaLLC |
| Fellowship alumni | Jelena Ožegović | Fellowship Alumni |
| Generic Names Supporting Organization –Council | Berry Cobb on behalf of GNSO Council | GNSO |
| Registries Stakeholder Group | Paul Diaz | RySG |
| Internet Infrastructure Coalition | Christian Dawson on behalf ofthe i2Coalition | I2Coalition |
| Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) | Brian Scarpelli | IPC |
| MarkMonitor | Stratton Hammock | Mark Monitor |
| Namibian Network Information Center | Dr. Eberhard W Lisse | NamibianNetwork Information Center |
| Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group | Rafik Dammak | NCSG |
| Radix | Priyanka Damwani of behalf ofSandeep Ramchandani | Radix |
| Registrar Stakeholder Group | Zoe Bonython | RrSG |
| DotAsia Organization | Jennifer Chung | DotAsiaOrganization |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee | Steve Sheng, on behalf ofSSAC Chair Rod Rasmussen | SSAC |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Swahili ICANN Wiki Ambassadors | Rebecca Ryakitmbo | Swahili ICANN Wiki Ambassadors |  |
| Ministry of Information Technologies andCommunications - Columbia | Jiafa Mararita Mezher Arango | Mintic |
| ICANN Business Constituency (BC)- Submitted Late | Steve DelBianco | BC |
| ICANN Internet Service Providers andConnectivity Providers-Submitted Late | Chantelle Doerksen on behalf of ISPCP | ISPCP |
| **Individuals:** |
|  | **Name** | **Affiliation (if provided)** | **Initials** |  |
| Amrita Choudhuryon | (none) | AC |
| Ayden Ferdeline | (none) | AF |
| Catherine Niwagaba | (none) | CN |
| Christa Taylor | (none) | CT |
| Isaac Maposa | (none) | IM |
| Jason Cutler | (none) | JC |
| John Poole | (none) | JP |
| Kurt Pritz | (none) | KP |
| Mason Cole | (none) | MC |
| Maureen Hilyard | (none) | MH |
| Olga Cavalli | (none) | OC |
| Simon Oginni | (none) | SO |
| Pablo Rodriguez | (none) | PR |
| Pascal Bekono | (none) | PB |
| Sarah Kiden | (none) | SK |
| Wisdom Donko | (none) | WD |
| Esther Patricia Akello | (none) | EPA |
| Roland LaPlante | (none) | RL |
| Jiafa Margarita Mezher Arango | (none) | JA |
| **Section III: Summary of Comments** |
| *General Disclaimer: This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer 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).*To gain a better understanding of the comments submitted, and to help community members reading this report, comments were segmented thematically rather than by group or individual. The comment themes are listed below in alphabetical order. The analysis section provides a high-level assessment of the observations, questions, and requests. Responses to individual comments are provided in the tables at the end of this report.The specific comments and ICANN’s responses will also be published as an Excel spreadsheet, to enable structured analysis by the community. |

 Budget Development Process and Document Contents / Structure

 Community Outreach / Engagement / Programs

 Community Travel Support / Funding

 Complaints Office

 Contractual Compliance

 Community Regional Outreach Program (CROP)

 Funding

 Funds Under Management

 GDD Operations and gTLDs

 General

 Headcount / Staffing

 ICANN Wiki

 IT Projects

 Language Services

 Other-Financial Management

 Policy Development

 Reserve Fund

 Strategic / Operating Priorities

**Section IV: Analysis of Comments**

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

**Budget Development Process and Document Contents/Structure**

A total of 16 comments were submitted on this topic by 6 working groups and two individuals. Several comments pertained to recommendations that would improve ease of readability and clarity for the community.

**Community Outreach / Engagement / Programs**

There were 22 comments submitted on this topic. These comments varied in scope, some expressing a need for more outreach in specific areas or regions, and others indicating a need for more explanation of resources allocated to outreach.

**Community Travel Support / Funding**

There were 36 comments by 10 different working groups and 16 individuals were submitted with a general theme of funding for community travel.

**Complaints Office**

One working group comment submitted a comment asking for clarity regarding the role of the complaints office operations.

**Contractual Compliance**

Three comments by three groups were submitted on contractual compliance. These comments focused on resources and budget for GDRP.

**Community Regional Outreach Program (CROP)**

Six comments by three different groups and two individuals were submitted with a general theme of funding for community travel.

**Funding**

There were 10 comments submitted by groups on various aspects of the topic of ICANN’s funding

assumptions.

**Funds Under Management**

One group comment was submitted regarding the investment policy.

**Global Domains Division (GDD) Operations and gTLDs**

There were 14 comments submitted by five working groups and 2 individuals. Some comments sought more explanation of GDD funding and others sought clarity on the next application round.

**General**

Seven comments by four different working groups and one individual were submitted with a general theme of clarification of information included in the draft documents.

**ICANN org Headcount**

A total of 19 comments were submitted by 10 working groups and two individuals regarding headcount and/or staffing. These comments were primarily indicating a need for further explanation and rationale for increases in headcount and personnel expenses.

**ICANN Wiki**

There were 13 comments from seven working groups and seven individuals were submitted to express support for a continued funding by ICANN of the ICANNWiki.

**IT Projects**

One comment by an individual was submitted regarding cloud based innovation.

**Language Services**

One comment by a working group was submitted on this topic in support of service levels.

**Other- Financial Management**

There were 13 comments submitted by 7 working groups and one individual seeking clarification.

**Policy Development**

Eight comments by 4 different working groups and one individual were submitted with a general theme of funding for policy programs.

**Reserve Fund**

Seven comments were submitted by five working groups and one individual expressing concern about the reserve fund and plans to replenish.

**Strategic / Operating Priorities**

Five comments were submitted by working groups indicating a need for more information on

GDPR.

**Budget Development Process and Document Contents/Structure**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 107 | GNSO | First, the GNSO Council wishes to thank the FinanceDepartment, and in particular Xavier Calvez and BeckyNash, for their receptiveness to community input and for responding so promptly and comprehensively to theclarifying questions that were submitted by the membersof the Standing Committee. We appreciate the granularity in the materials that were made available this year, and we express our appreciation for the fact that this material was published some five weeks earlier than it was for the FY18 budget cycle. As a suggestion, we request that a high-level summary of the key points, divided into a table of “what’s in” and “what’s out” of the proposed Budget, be provided moving forward. | Thank you for your feedback. ICANN org continually strives to provide more information in the publisheddocuments to enhance transparency and accountabilityto the public interest and community. The organization will consider incorporating this change in the FY20Operating Plan and Budget process. |
| 108 | GNSO | Second, the GNSO Council wishes to propose animprovement to ICANN org’s budget developmentprocess. The GNSO Council met in January to identify and prioritize its policy development and other activities in the coming year. We believe that the results of this exercise would prove an extremely effective tool to ICANN org in its development of the annual budget, in that it would provide the organization with clear, current status of anticipated timelines and thus help the organization more accurately account for policyimplementation in the annual budget. The GNSO Council considers an earlier, more robust communication andinformation gathering approach by ICANN org to be an important and necessary maturation in its budgeting and fiscal prudence | Thank you for your feedback. ICANN organization continually strives to provide more information in thepublished documents to enhance transparency and accountability to the public interest and community. Thesuggested additional analysis appears to be a useful improvement to the clarity of the information presented in the budget and the organization will considerincorporating this change in the FY20 Operating Plan and Budget process. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 109 | GNSO | Third, the GNSO Council, as manager of the GNSOpolicy development process and a decisional participant in the Empowered Community, believes it has a responsibility to examine ICANN’s overall spending patterns, examining in particular the organization’s effectiveness and efficiency. Going forward, the Council intends to explicitly document effectiveness andefficiency within our activities. We ask that ICANN org do the same, measuring the effectiveness and efficiency ofits operations in a way that the community finds meaningful and useful. | We appreciate that the GNSO Council intends toexplicitly document effectiveness and efficiency of their activities.In August 2017, ICANN org published an updatedAccountability Indicators dashboard. This is anevolution from our previous Key Performance Indicators(KPI) Dashboard. Based on feedback from the ICANN community, organization, and Board over the last couple of years, we have transformed the KPI Dashboard to better demonstrate the organization's accountability and transparency to the community. We recognize that ICANN is a unique organization, so market trends and industry benchmarks do not always apply. Other measures better demonstrate our progress, including perception measures such as satisfaction surveys and non-performance measures such as Board composition. ICANN org continues to review and refine Accountability Indicators after the publication of the draft Operating Plan and will continue after adoption by the Board.In the Accountability Indicators, you can download the underlying data and drill down to see the metrics. These metrics continue to evolve and ICANN org will continue to evaluate and identify additional metrics.Please find link to the Accountability Indicators here:<https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators> |

**Community Outreach / Engagement / Programs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref****#** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 114 | GNSO | The GNSO Council’s Standing Committee has haddetailed discussions about the resources allocated to global engagement activities, and found that there are many unanswered questions, some of which relate to the value proposition of these expenditures. At ICANN 59, GSE presented to the Council about their activities along with Finance in response to the Council's comment on the FY18 budget. As promised then, the GNSO Councilawaits availability of measures of success as it relates to global engagement activities to ensure that they are allclosely aligned with ICANN's mission, and assess howactivities meet these criteria. We believe that there should be a particular focus on tangible outcomes; both directly and indirectly. We recognize that ICANN is part of a larger Internet governance ecosystem, but remain concerned that the impact of many of ICANN’s engagement activities are not yet subject to the discipline of reliable metrics and performance measurement. It is therefore difficult to ascertain ICANN’s participation or sponsorship of events as this relates to ICANN’s core mission around policy development. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response tocomment #51. |
| 116 | GNSO | The GNSO Council understands the need for ICANN toconsider areas where cost-savings can be achieved, and we applaud ICANN for the changing philosophy in providing for more responsible budget management. However, we were surprised that the recent announcement of cost-savings was made absent any consultation with the community and contained no detailed rationale. Similarly, core activities such as the community Regional Outreach Program were discontinued without prior community input and/or notification. Without commenting specifically on any particular program, we do note that drastic cuts were made in the proposed budget, without consultation, toprograms that were previously considered “core”. Going forward, the GNSO Council respectfully requests an opportunity to provide input in advance of any future proposed discontinuation of programs related the management and operation of policy development processes. | This public comment proceeding is intended to elicit thediverse views of the community on what types of projects ICANN org should prioritize in the FY19 Operating Plan and Budget. Public comment submissions on the draft documents are a critical part of the annual budget planning cycle, including in the preparation of a final proposed FY19 Operating Plan and Budget. Community comments on proposals to fund specific projects, whether wholly, partially or not at all, can be particularly helpful during the budget planning cycle. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref****#** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 118 | GNSO | The GNSO Council supports ICANN in its efforts toevaluate the future of its capacity development programs, including the Fellowship, NextGen@ICANN, Global Indigenous Ambassador, ICANN Academy, and Community Onboarding programs. While we do not discount the value of these programs as a general matter, we do consider it important to undertake continuous evaluation through measurable metrics of success, especially in an environment of high workload, volunteer burnout and budget constraints. We encourage ICANN to undertake a critical assessment on the measurable benefits of all programs in terms of bringing active participants into the ICANN community, particularly as it relates to participation in PDP WGs and leadership positions of SGs/Cs. | Capacity development remains an important area forGlobal Stakeholder Engagement at ICANN and a key pillar of the regional engagement strategies. Capacity development allows for participants from underserved regions and participants with limited resources to gain knowledge that will enable them to become active participants in ICANN's technical and policy work.Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to comment #51 regarding the Accountability Metrics. |

**Community Travel Support / Funding**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref****#** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 110 | GNSO | Fourth, the GNSO Council takes seriously its responsibilities as apart of the Empowered Community. As a result, we have carefully reviewed the budget to understand what resources have been allocated relative to other parts of the community, both to ensure appropriate funding and to ensure we are fully accountable for the resources that we utilize. We have been unable to approximate the levels of financial support provided directly and indirectly tothe various Supporting Organizations, Advisory Groups, and associated stakeholder groups and constituencies. We need tohave this information in order to hold ourselves, and others,mutually accountable. In particular, we would like to know whether the GNSO is receiving an appropriate level of supportcommensurate with the responsibilities conferred on the GNSOvia the ICANN Bylaws. | ICANN org will evaluate the feasibility of providinggreater clarity on levels of financial support provided directly to the parts of the community in future budget development cycles. This will be considered without compromising the ability to produce useful information and engage adequately with the community. ICANN org will also evaluate the impact on resource requirements associated with this increased analysis. The Policy Development Support function is well-managed and is able to match available resources with necessary activities. As FY19 will be a difficult budget year, no specific amount has been allocated for additional policy work beyond what has been identified and planned for already. Should it become necessary, however, the Policy Development Support team and the Finance team will work together to try to find additional resources that can support the community's work. ICANN org welcomes the GNSO Council's input on what should be priority projects as well as any specific additional capability or expertise that may be needed to support the GNSO's work in FY19 and beyond. |

**Complaints Office**

None from GNSO Council

**Contractual Compliance**

None from GNSO Council

**CROP**

None from GNSO Council

**FUNDING**

None from GNSO Council

**g**

**Funds Under Management**

None from GNSO Council

**GDD Operations and gTLDs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 113 | GNSO | The GNSO Council acknowledges that the FY19 draft budget does not account for development or resources towards the next round of new gTLDs(as mentioned in Document #2, Section 2.5.1, on page an expectation that consensusrecommendations will be adopted by the Board prior to the conclusion of FY19. As noted under Portfolio 2.1.1, which contains a project for“Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs” with a description of “Activities related to (1) tracking andreporting on the community’s work to prepare for subsequent procedures for new gTLDs; and (2) planning for and implementation of policyrecommendations on subsequent procedures” witha budget amount of $300K, we believe that this is insufficient to meet the probable resourcing needs(based on the budget allocations to policyimplementation for the 2012 round of new gTLDs). Therefore, the GNSO Council recommends adequate budget is made available to allow for preparatory work to expedite the start of the next round(s). | ICANN org thanks the GNSO Council for the comment and for contributing to ICANN’s FY19 Operating Plan and Budget process.In discussing subsequent procedures for gTLDs, it is important to differentiate between eventual implementation of GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP recommendations and any preparatory work that can be done in advance of opening of the next application process. Implementation of GNSO policy recommendations follows an established process per theGNSO PDP Manual (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/annex-2- pdp-manual-16feb16-en.pdf) and the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework (https://[www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-](http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-) policy-implementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf), which require GNSO Council's adoption of the PDP recommendations as well as ICANN Board's approval before implementation can commence. It is premature to plan for implementation of the policy recommendations during FY19 because PDPdiscussions are still ongoing. When the recommendations are finalized, the Board will consider the recommendations andhow to fund the implementation.Although formal implementation of the PDP recommendations cannot commence until the ICANN Board's approval in accordance with established processes, some preparatory work for the opening of the next application process could be done earlier as the Board previously noted in its July 2017 response to the RySG(https://[www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-](http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
|  |  |  | to-diaz-26jul17-en.pdf). ICANN org is working with the Board todetermine possible preparatory work that could be done. An important aspect of this discussion is the potential of re-work if the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group provides policy recommendations or implementation guidance that is different from the preparatory work already done. This does not mean that no preparatory work should be done, rather it highlights the importance of planning and coordination with the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. The determination of possible preparatory work will then lead to identification of funding to support the work, and would be submitted for Board approval as appropriate. ICANN org will keep the community appraised of the outcome of this process. |

**General**

None from GNSO Council

**ICANN org Headcount**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 117 | GNSO | The GNSO Council recognizes the growth in theorganization’s personnel costs by $7.3 million(11%) over FY18. The overall budgeted personnel costs of $76.8 million comprise 56% of the $138 million budget, and a further $23.4 million, or 17% of the budget, is allocated to professional services. In principle, the GNSO Council believes that growth of staff numbers should only occur under explicit justification and replacements due to staff attrition should always occur with tight scrutiny; especially in times of stagnate funding levels. When considering personnel allocation and costs, we emphasize the need for prioritizing mission critical work like policy development and implementation of GNSO consensus policies. Of the 25 FTE increase from current actuals, through the FY18 forecast, and the FY19 budget, none of the increases apply to policy development and only a handful occur where implementation and reviews take place. The GNSO Council currently manages five large PDPs in addition to other activities, many of which are expected to operate through FY19and beyond, and while there are no proposed FTEcuts to Goal 1.3, we are concerned that GNSO policy staff support is at their limit (if not beyond) to take on additional work of the GNSO without impacts to quality that we depend on. This complements the expected need of professional experts as noted at the start of these specific comments. Further, while the information within the draft budget has improved considerably over the years, the Council would like to see in futurebudget cycles information to better evaluate and justify the overall staff expense and plannedgrowth. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to comment #6. |

**ICANN Wiki**

None from GNSO Council

**ICANN Wiki**

**IT Projects**

None from GNSO Council

**Language Services**

None from GNSO Council

**Other – Financial Management**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 115 | GNSO | The GNSO Council supports in principle the proposed sustainability audit (referring to the proposed reductionsnoted in Document #2, Section 2.5.3, on page 23), particularly in light of current budgetary pressures. The purpose, scope, and cost of this audit are, however,unclear. Additional information is required in order to properly assess this proposed reduction. | The sustainability audit is intended to be a finite research project, a benchmark of sorts, to learn moreabout our existing carbon footprint, including the impact of ICANN’s operations, travel and meetings. We would use that research to determine if and howto make changes to any of our activities from a cost and emissions point of view. |
| 119 | GNSO | The GNSO Council is cognizant of the low uptake ofICANN’s language services and the high cost involved in delivering real-time interpretation. We therefore supportICANN in its outlined efforts to focus translation andinterpretation resources based on necessary and justifiable needs. We would like to help ICANN identify these needswithin our own policy development activities. | We will be publishing an updated Language ServicesPolicy and Procedures soon, and welcome your thoughts in the corresponding public commentperiod. Your participation will be critical to helping usrefine our approach. |

**Policy Development**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 27 | AF | I would never call for austerity at the expense of goodjudgement. If I thought these programmes were succeeding in bringing new active participants into ICANN policy processes, I would enthusiastically support their continuation. After all, their cost as a percentage of the overall budget is negligible. But I feel very strongly that they do not work. However, there is a final point that I would like to make, and I believe it to be an important one. While I support ICANN in its decision to reduce the size of these programmes, I have a procedural objection. I do not support drastic and dramatic cuts being made to core budgetary items without community consultation. This budget, which contained the proposal to shrink the fellowship and NextGen programmes, was published on19 January 2018. It was not until 31 January 2018 thatICANN staff opened a consultation to understand community perspectives on the future of the fellowship programme. No such consultation has been opened on the NextGen programme, with the fellowship consultation documents specifically requesting that the community not comment on NextGen. This is improper. ICANN should not put forward such proposals without first listening to community input on the effectiveness of theseprogrammes (in terms of leading to engagement with ICANN’s policy development processes, and ICANN’s core mission) and publishing evidence supporting the reduction in the programme’s size. I believe the organization holds enough data already to be able to make the case: the names of the fellowship alumni are public, as are the names of those who are in leadership roles both within the community and on the Board. It should not be a huge task to map out just how effective the fellowship programme has been at bringing in new, | The public comment process is intended to elicit thediverse views of the community on what types of projects ICANN should prioritize in the FY19Operating Plan and Budget. Public comment submissions on the draft documents are a critical partof the annual budget planning cycle, including in the preparation of a final proposed FY19 Operating Planand Budget. ICANN org encourages the commentatorto also submit this feedback to the ongoing consultation on the Fellowship Program so that the input can be taken into account in considering whether changes and improvements to the Fellowship Program should be made. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
|  |  | active participants into the ICANN community when thereis 10 years of data already available. ICANN should do this. Just as I have anecdotes of where I have seen the programme fail, others will have anecdotes of fellowship success stories. Anecdotes can guide us just as easily as they can mislead us. There’s the inevitable selection bias (only the exceptional cases make for interesting stories), there are no controls for confounding variables, and sometimes they aren’t even verifiable. But ICANN can generate objective, systematic data by mapping out what has been the actual progression of fellowship alumni into ICANN leadership roles. There is one ICANN-funded capacity development programme that I think does have the potential to work: the pilot community onboarding programme. I understand that this project is not being funded in FY19, and I support that decision, but I would suggest this perhaps be re-considered in FY20 and beyond following community consultation. |  |
| 71 | NamibianNetworkInformationCenter | 4 Policy Development ProcessNA-NiC is aware of the fact that a Cross ConstituencyPolicy Development Process might be required, | The Fellowship Program is not a topic that can be appropriately addressed through a policy developmentprocess, and a community consultation has been launched to facilitate ICANN organization'sassessment of the Program. ICANN org encourages the commentator to also submit this feedback to the ongoing consultation on the Fellowship Program sothat the input can be taken into account in considering whether changes and improvements to the FellowshipProgram should be made. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
| 93 | RySG | 2.4. Policy Development and Policy ImplementationA budget necessarily balances competing demands and projects around an organization’s mission and objectives. For ICANN, funding the policy development process and associated policy implementation work is a core obligation that should take priority over other projects at times when trade-offs are required. | This public comment proceeding is intended to elicitthe diverse views of the community on what types of projects the ICANN org should prioritize in the FY19Operating Plan and Budget. Public comment submissions on the draft documents are a critical part of the annual budget planning cycle, including in thepreparation of a final proposed FY19 Operating Plan and Budget. ICANN org is mindful of the critical natureof core policy work undertaken by the community and supported by the Policy Development Support Team.Each year every ICANN org department is called uponto plan for the activities in the coming year. ICANN org recognizes that this is a challenge, as the yearlyissues and "hot topics" can change between the budget planning process period and the actual timethat resources are needed. The Policy Development Support function is well-managed and in generally is able to match available resources with necessaryactivities. It is up to the community, however, to highlight particular projects that it believes are high-priority and that require specific resources, especially in this challenging budget year. |
| 111 | GNSO | The GNSO Council wishes to underline the fact that GNSO policy development and coordination is a core ICANN activity that should be prioritized with respect toother ICANN activities. We would like to understand whatproportion of the organization’s spend can be reasonablyconnected to policy development activities. Our feeling is that this allocation is not adequate at present. The GNSO Council anticipates that our active Policy Development Process Working Groups will require funds in FY19 in order to meet the terms of their respective charters. Whilespecifics cannot be foreseen in detail at this time, activities like face-to-face meetings, training of leaders, an annual Council induction, and/or the provision of relevant | The public comment process is intended to elicit the diverse views of the community on what types of projects ICANN should prioritize in the FY19Operating Plan and Budget. Public comment submissions on the draft documents are a critical partof the annual budget planning cycle, including in the preparation of a final proposed FY19 Operating Planand Budget. ICANN org is mindful of the critical natureof core policy work undertaken by the community and supported by the Policy Development Support Team. Each year every ICANN org department is called upon to plan for the activities in the coming year. ICANN org recognizes that this is a challenge, as the yearly |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
|  |  | professional expert assistance are likely candidates.Recent examples have included external legal advice for the RDS PDP and the data acquisition via survey for the RPM PDP. | issues and "hot topics" can change between thebudget planning process period and the actual time that resources are needed. The Policy Development Support function is well-managed and in generally is able to match available resources with necessary activities. As FY19 will be a difficult budget year, no specific amount has been allocated for additional policy work beyond what has been identified as a current need. Should it become necessary, however, the Policy Development Support team and theFinance team will work together to try to find additional resources that can support the community's work.ICANN org welcomes the GNSO Council's input onwhat should be priority projects as well as any specific additional capability or expertise that may be needed to support the GNSO's work in FY19 and beyond. |
| 112 | GNSO | The GNSO Council has submitted an additional budgetaryrequest to hold a Strategic Planning Session in 2019. This follows on from a very productive and successful pilot session in 2018. We ask that the resources be made available by the organization for its continuation, while recognizing that other Stakeholder Groups/Constituencies have different priorities that may compete with the support of this request at the Council level. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response tocomment #99. |
| 120 | GNSO | The GNSO Council welcomes suggestions as to which, if any, areas of ICANN org operations could be automated to enhance cost saving in policy development activities overyears to come. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to comment #112. ICANN org welcomes the GNSO Council's wish to engage in longer term planning,particularly in relation to ensuring cost savings while providing the necessary support for the community'swork. This should include ways to streamline and automate certain GNSO working group procedures, many of them requiring additional personnel time toadminister and maintain. Some preparatory work on automated processes is already underway and willcontinue. ICANN org also welcomes opportunities to |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
|  |  |  | continue this discussion with the GNSO Council, inplanning for FY19 and beyond. |
| 138 | RrSG | Prioritization of Policy Development Work By contrast, we note that the same page shows a freeze on expendituresfor new or priority policy work. Given that this work is, in our view, the primary mission and function of ICANN, weencourage you to guard this area against any future cuts,and ensure it is appropriately resourced. | The public comment process is intended to elicit the diverse views of the community on what types ofprojects ICANN should prioritize in the FY19Operating Plan and Budget. Public comment submissions on the draft documents are a critical partof the annual budget planning cycle, including in the preparation of a final proposed FY19 Operating Planand Budget. ICANN org is mindful of the critical nature of core policy work undertaken by the community andsupported by the Policy Development Support Team. Each year every ICANN org department is called upon to plan for the activities in the coming year. ICANN orgrecognizes that this is a challenge, as the yearly issues and "hot topics" can change between thebudget planning process period and the actual time that resources are needed. The Policy Development Support function is well-managed and in generally isable to match available resources with necessary activities. As FY19 will be a difficult budget year, nospecific amount has been allocated for additional policy work beyond what has been identified as a current need. Should it become necessary, however,the Policy Development Support team and theFinance team will work together to try to find additional resources that can support the community's work.ICANN org welcomes the Registrar StakeholderGroup's input on what should be priority projects as well as any specific additional capability or expertise |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref #** | **Contributor** | **Question / Comment** | **ICANN Response** |
|  |  |  | that may be needed to support the community's policywork in FY19 and beyond. |

**Reserve Fund**

None from GNSO Council

**Strategic/Operating Priorities**

None from GNSO Council

**Late Comments**

None from GNSO Council