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Reviews: One of several important accountability mechanisms

### ICANN Accountability Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconsideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Review Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Information Disclosure Policy [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mechanisms [1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccNSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Liaison Group [2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AoC Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and Transparency-(ATRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS-(SSR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOIS Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Includes extensive other ways that ICANN is accountable.

[2] Organizational review is not mandated by ICANN Bylaws and other mechanisms are used to review commitments.
Upcoming Reviews
Proposed AoC and Organizational Reviews Timelines

- AoC Reviews schedule is pending dialogue with NTIA
- The timeline reflects: (1) AoC – call for volunteers, conduct of review, Board consideration and action and implementation; (2) Organizational – conduct of review, Board consideration and action and implementation
- Organizational Reviews pre-planning activities will take place in the months leading up to the start of the Review.
AoC Review Process

More information @ icann.org
Composition of Past AoC Review Teams

64 Review Team Members
16 in each Review (ATRT1, ATRT2, SSR and WHOIS)
Section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments states:

“If and when new gTLDs have been in operation for one year, ICANN will organize a review that will examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of (a) the application and evaluation process, and (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion.”
## Overview

- The CCT Review Team (RT) will evaluate the New gTLD Program for its progress in enhancing competition, consumer trust and consumer choice.
- Data on a number of community-recommended metrics have been collected and published.

## Key Points

- List of applicants will be published
- Looking for range of volunteers with expertise in CCT
- CEO and GAC chair will select RT members
- Some community-recommended metrics are now available online.
New gTLD Program
ICANN’s Multi-stakeholder model & procedures
Consumer protection matters
New gTLD rights protection mechanisms
Mitigating DNS and potential security threats
Competition and market issues
Quantitative analysis and information systems
Intellectual property rights protection
CCT Review – High Level Timeline

- **30 Oct 2015**: Deadline to apply as RT volunteer/independent expert
- **2 Nov 2015**: Publication of applicants
- **30 Nov 2015**: Deadline for SO/AC endorsements
- **Dec 2015**: RT selected and announced
- **Jan 2016**: 1st RT meeting
- **Dec 2016**: Final report issued
Reviews in Process
GNSO2
At-Large Review
ICANN’s **Bylaws** require that its structures be reviewed on a 5 year cycle.

- **Article IV: Accountability and Review**, Section 4.1 references that “The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council ... by an entity or entities **independent** of the organization under review.”

- Goals of the review shall be to determine:
  
  i. whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and
  
  ii. if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness
Organizational Review Process

- Standard Operating Procedures
- Plan Review
- Conduct Review
- Plan Implementation
- Implement Improvements

More information @ icann.org
GNSO Review Timeline

May 2014
- Formation of GNSO Review Working Party

June 2014 – September 2015
- Westlake engagement as Independent Examiner
- Data gathering and consultations at ICANN meetings

- Working Text and comments

Jan – Mar 2015
- Jun – Aug 2015
- Draft Report and comments

September 2015
- Final Report
GNSO Review - By the Numbers

- **22** GNSO Review Working Party Meetings
- **24** Public sessions @ ICANN meetings
- **178** Completed 360 Survey; 40 one-on-one Interviews*
  *Compared to an average of 71 surveys and 60 interviews for prior Organizational Reviews
- **1,300+** Unique page views to Wiki, Announcements and Blogs
- **7** Webinars, Blogs & Videos
- Public Comments from **12** Organizations & **3** Individuals
## GNSO Review - Surveys and Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Survey Responses</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccNSO</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSO</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

178 Completed 360 Survey; 40 one-on-one Interviews*

*Compared to an average of 71 surveys and 60 interviews for prior Organizational Reviews.
GNSO Review - 36 Recommendations

1. Participation and Representation
2. Continuous Development (including PDP)
3. Transparency
4. Alignment with ICANN’s future

- Working Party and staff conducting feasibility & prioritization assessment for input to OEC
GNSO Review - Feasibility & Prioritization

1. Ease of implementation
2. Resources needed to implement
3. Alignment with strategic direction
4. Dependence and impact on other groups/work
5. Need for additional information
GNSO Review - Next Steps

15 Sept
Westlake Final Report sent to OEC and posted on icann.org

28 Sept
Westlake Presentation to Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC)

Oct-Nov
“Last Call” GNSO Review WP Provides Final Input on Feasibility & Implementation

Feb 2016
OEC Considers Feasibility Assessment, Makes Recommendation to the Board

Mar 2016
ICANN Board Action on Final Report
At-Large Review
At-Large Review - Proposed Timeline

Preparation: Scope of Work, Criteria

- Jul-Oct 2015
- Preparation: Scope of Work, Criteria

Competitive Bidding/RFP & Initial Assessment of 2008 Recommendations (Self-Assessment)

- Nov ‘15-Mar ‘16
- Competitive Bidding/RFP & Initial Assessment of 2008 Recommendations (Self-Assessment)

Conduct Review

- Apr ’16-Jan ‘17
- Conduct Review

Final Report

- Jan ‘17
- Final Report

Board Action, Plan Implementation and Implement Improvements

- Feb ‘17-TBD
- Board Action, Plan Implementation and Implement Improvements

Working Party Activities:
- Feedback on Timeline, Scope of Work, Criteria and Methodology
- Initial Assessment of 2008 Recommendations (Self-Assessment)
At-Large Review - Scope of Work

Assess effectiveness of.....

- Improvements resulting from recommendations from the 2008 Review
- At-Large organization - ALAC, Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) and At-Large Structures (ALSes)

...relative to specified evaluation criteria
At-Large Review - Evaluation Criteria

- Fulfilment of Mission
  - Adherence to Policies/Procedures
  - Organizational Support

- Accountability & Transparency to the Public
- Membership Processes & Participation
  - Communication

- Governance & Management
- Effectiveness of Execution
- Evaluation & Measurement of Outcomes
- Effectiveness of Implementation of Prior Review Recommendations

Additional criteria to be considered by Review Working Party
At-Large Review - Methodology

• Online surveys
  ✓ Quantitative and qualitative elements focused on evaluation criteria
  ✓ Feedback from members of At-Large Community, interested members from ICANN community and other structures, members of the Board and staff
• Observation of proceedings
• One-on-one interviews
• Review and analysis of documentation and records
## At-Large Review - Proposed Independent Examiner Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Understanding of the assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Knowledge and expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstrated experience in conducting broadly similar examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not-for-profit experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Basic knowledge of ICANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic and cultural diversity, multilingualism, gender balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Suitability of proposed CVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proposed methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work organization, project management approach, timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Suitability of tools and methods or work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clarity of deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting the timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to adjust to circumstances that could extend the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- General adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reference checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Financial value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional criteria to be considered by Review Working Party**
Status: Implementation of Prior Review Recommendations
As of 30 June 2015

• Information on AoC Reviews and status of implementation of recommendations can be found on new web pages: https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/aoc
• Consequence of AoC Review recommendations is that they stimulate long-term improvement efforts
• Quarterly 30 September 2015 update will be posted by 15 November 2015
### Milestone Completion
- 67% completed
- 20% on schedule
- 13% behind schedule

### Responsibility
- Board: 5%
- Community: 28%
- Staff: 67%

### News and Announcements

**Progress on Implementing ATRT2 Recommendations**

Implementation of ATRT2 recommendations began June 2014. ATRT2 issued 12 recommendations consisting of 51 components, translated into 117 milestones planned using PMI best practices. To date, 67% of milestones completed, 20% on schedule, 13% are behind. Community, Board & staff are collaborating on implementation. Click link for more information.
ATRT2 Recommendation 7 Implementation
Public Comment Improvements
30 June 2015

Implementation 7 Timeline

Centralized public comment page live on icann.org
Enhanced visual timeline for public comment live on icann.org
Ability to “follow” public comments on icann.org
Eliminate Reply Cycle/Expand Comment period
Create Staff Summary Report Inquiry Process
Snapshot of public comment data 6 months after implementation
Publish Report for Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 7 Implementation Description

ATRT2 Recommendation 7 identifies various mechanisms to improve public comment periods through process modifications and the use of new tools. The Board has specifically instructed staff to create and implement a process to enable those who comment during public comment periods to request changes to staff synthesis reports in cases where commenters believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comments.

The project improvements are now fully operationalized. Staff assessments will take place later this year to measure the effectiveness of the improvements and to determine what further steps can be taken to improve public comment and other community input mechanisms for the organization.
What Constitutes Success?

Defined/Measureable = Completed Implementation

Specific
Measurable
Actionable
Realistic
Time-bound
Lessons Learned & Process Improvements
### Highlights from Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community buy-in is essential for successful implementation of improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feedback loop &amp; measurable improvements contribute to buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Link Review outputs to Strategic Planning and other ICANN processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reviews of individual organizations should align with ICANN core values and strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plan thoughtfully: apply relevant elements, realistic timelines, clear directions and definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implementation plans to contain objectives, milestones, resources, timeline &amp; evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process Improvements

1. Clear and focused Review terms of reference and work plan
2. Budget Management & Cost Tracking
3. Apply accepted best practices from recognized organizations used in similar performance assessments
4. Identify key drivers of cost to maximize scarce resources
5. Designate several RT members to be involved in implementation planning and periodic assessment
6. Develop policies, procedures and guidelines to document and systematize review processes
Accountability

ICANN has a proven commitment to accountability and transparency in all of its practices. Indeed, ICANN considers these principles to be fundamental safeguards in ensuring that its international, bottom-up and multi-stakeholder operating model remains effective.

The mechanisms through which ICANN archives accountability and transparency are built into every level of its organization and mandate - beginning with its Bylaws and Affirmation of Commitments.

ICANN Accountability Mechanisms

- Reconsideration
- Ombudsman
- Independent Review Process
- Document Information Disclosure Policy [1]
- Other Mechanisms [1]

Organizational Review

- At-Large
- ASO
- ccNSO
- GNSO
- Nominating Committee
- RSSAC
- SSAC
- Board of Directors [2]
- Technical Liaison Group [2]

AoC Reviews

- Accountability and Transparency-(ATRT)
- Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS-(SSR)
- WHOIS Policy
- Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice
Discussion
Proposed Discussion Topics

- How can we achieve more diverse participation in the review process?

- What other improvements would the Community like to see in the conduct of AoC or organizational reviews?

- Recognizing the over-commitment of the Community, how can we enhance the ability of the Community to participate and provide input to these reviews?
Resources

Please share your views and send your ideas to Reviews@icann.org.

Visit session details page for links to additional information: (https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/wed-aoc-org-reviews)

Review web pages - https://www.icann.org/resources/accountability
SSR Implementation Status
CCT Call for Volunteers
WHOIS Implementation Status
ATRT2 Implementation Status
GNSO Review Community Wiki
At-Large Review Community Wiki