Below (and attached) is the comment of ICANN’s Business Constituency (BC), regarding First Consultation on a 2-Year Planning Process

The BC thanks ICANN Org for the proposal on a 2-year process as a mechanism to create more time to plan ICANN activities.

Noting that the current time-frame for the planning process is 15 month, the BC believes this is adequate to address ICANN fiscal activities in tandem with the approved strategic plan.

However, the BC would like to submit the following questions and responses to questions poised.

Question : Is there any precedence for this type of budgeting plan over a 2-year cycle?

A budgeting plan for a 5-year Operations/Strategic plan with annual incremental/decremental budget provision do exist but a 2-yearly revolving activities planning may be duplicative and engender an excessive oversight into the staff responsibility domain and may not be the best use of precious community time.

Responses to Questions posed to the Community

Question 1 - Does the community agree that the yearly planning cycle does not provide sufficient time for community extensive input and interaction on the operating plan and budget?

No. The yearly planning cycle provides sufficient time.

Question 2 - Does the community believe that more time for planning provides more transparency?

Yes but the current time is quite sufficient.

For the following questions, the answers are embedded in bold.

Question 3 – How and who should set ICANN’s priorities?

The current ICANN strategic plan does not prioritize the 5 strategic objectives, they are equally important.

- Should parts of the strategic plan be prioritized of the 5 years it applies to? Yes
- From the strategic trends exercises conducted with several community organizations during 2018:
  - “there is no prioritization, everything is #1 and nothing is #1”. There is need for prioritization.
“are the community priorities aligned with ICANN mission/vision?” Yes.

“Focus on technical functions as a priority and avoid allowing budget constraints to negatively affect them” Yes.

Question 4 – Should policy development and implementation activities be integral to the planning cycle?

For the purpose of better using the limited availability of the community stakeholders, already stretched, and to appropriately allocate ICANN’s support resources, policy development needs and activities could be considered during the planning process:

- Should the policy development activities be planned? Yes.
- What should be planned collectively by the SO/AC? Based on exploration and need.
- What should be planned by the GNSO and ccNSO? Policy Development works, Reviews, Research.

Question 5 - What activities, other than policy development, should be planned and by whom?
Examples: Reviews - SO/AC with support from ICANN org.

Question 6 - Should the planning process include a formalized dedicated phase to plan for SO/AC activities? If so, how many years should be planned for?
Yes, 5 years in sync with the 5-year Strategic Plan.

Process questions:

- Would it be beneficial to insert, in the early part of the planning process, a phase of activity planning resulting in a document submitted for a first public comment period, and follow it by an operating plan and budget development phase which would be the subject of a second public comment period? Yes.
- What are the barriers to community engagement in the planning process?
  
  Lack of available time? Yes, as most community members are volunteers.
  
  Complexity of the information produced? No.
  
  Complexity or length of the planning process? No.
  
  Lack of relevance or interest? No.

--

This comment was drafted by Jimson Olufuye, with input from the BC’s Finance Committee.
It was approved in accord with our charter.

--
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