
DUBLIN – AoC and Organizational Reviews
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 – 10:45 to 12:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the AoC and Organizational Reviews in Auditorium on October 21, 2015 from 10:45 am to 12:00 pm.

THERESA SWINEHART: We're going to give everybody two more minutes. Well, I guess we'll start. I know we have a lot of different sessions running in parallel. While we may have a smaller crowd at this one, I think what's most important is that we actually have a really good conversation, and then in addition, all of the sessions are transcribed and archived, and so it provides an important avenue and resource for the global participants, as well.

Let me just start off. First of all, the reviews are something that is very much around the operationalizing of a lot of the discussions that we're seeing, even in the accountability discussions. The reviews are obviously in the bylaws and the Affirmation of Commitments and are an important part of the organization's evolution.

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.

From that standpoint, the volunteer community involvement with them, the expertise that comes with them, is invaluable. This discussion here is a good opportunity to get an update of where things are in some of the areas that we're starting to look at moving forward.

With that, we have a great panel. We have Margie, who is on the team here from strategic initiatives department, who oversees many of the areas, along with Larisa, who likewise oversees many of the areas on the reviews; Rinalia, who is a member of our board and the chair of the OEC Committee; and then Chris Disspain, likewise a board member and the chair of the BGC. With that, I'll thank everybody for coming and turn it over to Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you very much, Theresa. As you mentioned before, this is a session on the reviews as mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments and organizational reviews for ICANN, all of which support ICANN's accountability. It's quite important, but we realize that we may not have many people in the room due to competing parallel activities, and I'm sure that they will be listening in later.

Before we start, I'd like to ask Chris Disspain to give some remarks in relation to the AoC reviews.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Rinalia, and good morning. I just briefly wanted to level set before we start this discussion.

In respect to the ATRT2 review that is being shepherded, if you will, by the BGC (the Board Governance Committee) and I hope that people have noticed the much more detailed reporting that is going on in respect to bringing the ATRT2 recommendations into being. There are copious amounts of detail out there. I think the reports are quarterly with lots of detail and really important if you're interested in seeing the progress of those recommendations to look at those.

Secondly, we hear every now and then from people that ATRT1 recommendations haven't been completed yet. Now, if you have a specific ATRT1 recommendation that you believe hasn't been dealt with, then we would like to hear about it. But from our point of view, the ATRT2 Review Committee actually looked at the status of ATRT1, and in its recommendations gave us a list of what it thought hadn't yet been implemented, and in fact, in some cases actually suggested ways of moving it forward.

Part of the problem we have is that some of the recommendations we receive – and this is the case in all reviews, not just in the ATRT – it’s very hard to measure success. It’s very hard to measure what is finalizing, what is completion. One of the things that we’re looking at very closely for future reviews is to ensure that, in the review recommendations, we get clear understanding from the review team of what it is that they actually want to have happen, and also that the recommendations themselves are prioritized by the review team rather than by us.

But I encourage everyone to look at the ATRT reports that come out. They do provide a huge level of detail, and I think you’ll see that in general terms, there’s been significant and meaningful progress.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Chris. There’s quite a bit of material that’s going to be presented today. There will be something on upcoming reviews, reviews in process, implementation of prior review recommendations, lessons learned and process improvements, and then discussion.

To give you a heads up on what we would like to hear from you about is essentially how do we achieve more diverse

participation in the review process, because this has been a challenge; what improvements would you like to see in the conduct of AoC and organizational reviews; and also recognizing that time is an issue in terms of over commitment of community work. Basically, the workload. How do we enhance the ability of the community to participate and provide input to these reviews?

Please bear this in mind as you are seeing the presentation so that we can come to a good discussion at the end. With that, I hand it over to Margie Milam.

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you. I'm Margie Milam, and I'm in the Strategic Initiatives department.

What we're going to talk about today are several aspects of the reviews. We'll talk a little bit about the upcoming reviews, how they are processed. Also to give you some insight on how implementation takes place, and what kind of lessons learned are there. What kind of lessons can we learn from the past reviews? As Rinalia mentioned, there's a number of questions that we'd like to hear from you at the end as to how we can improve the process.

For those of you that may not know, the reviews are one of the key accountability mechanisms for ICANN. They're spelled out in a couple of places. One being the ICANN bylaws where there's a commitment, and then the ICANN bylaws to take a look at each of our organizations – the At-Large, the ASO, the ccNSO, GNSO, the other advisory committees – and to see how they are effective and how they can be improved.

We also have under the Affirmation of Commitments community led reviews that take a look at specific topics. As Chris was mentioning, there are reviews of accountability and transparency that have taken place. We look at the security and stability and resiliency of the DNS. There's been reviews on the WHOIS policy.

The next one that's about ready to kick off is the Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review that will look at the new gTLD program.

Essentially, as we go through these processes and complete them, we really are trying to seek input on how we can improve the processes and how we can ensure that the implementation meets the needs of the community and the expectations of the review team.

If you take a look at some of the improvements that have taken place as a result of these reviews, you might remember that some of the information that's available now has been vastly improved. For example, with regard to board decisions, you can now find a detailed rationale for board resolutions, and that's published within 21 days of a board meeting. Those improvements came from ATRT recommendations in the past.

There's also been recommendations that relate to how directors are nominated by the nominating committee and what kind of criteria we look at to appoint directors. Again, that came from recommendations from prior review teams.

We've also taken a look at how to enhance the relationships. For example, the interaction between the GAC and the board. There's now a formal process that takes a look at advice received by the GAC and how it's tracked and how the board reacts to it. All of that stems from recommendations from past reviews. These are really effective mechanisms to be able to improve the processes that are important to ICANN.

Now I'll talk a little bit about the upcoming reviews as we're ready to kick off one of the large ones. Part of the problem under the current review cycle is that the timeline for the reviews is spelled out either in the bylaws or the Affirmation of Commitments.

At the last meeting in Buenos Aires, we came to the community and alerted the community to the fact that we had a number of reviews that were going to kick off all at once. If you look at the slide, you can see that there are nine that were scheduled to kick off in the 2015 to 2016 time period.

We actually heard from the community concerns about the ability of the community to participate in so many reviews, so we went to the board in July and asked for a postponement of the reviews so that we could stagger their start dates in order to ensure that we would have adequate community participation. Even with this postponement, it's a quite aggressive schedule.

For example, we have the Consumer Choice and Trust review that's kicking off now. We have the review of the security and stability and resiliency of the DNS. That will start in June of next year. The second WHOIS Review Team will start in October of next year. We will also have the At-Large review, the NomCom review, the RSSAC review, and the SSAC review all coming in 2016 and 2017.

Part of what we're struggling with as staff is in addition to the staff resources and the resources that are needed to hire consultants to support those reviews and do the independent examination, we're worried that we won't have enough community involvement because each of these reviews typically

go out and seek information and input from the community on how we're doing with respect to all of these aspects, and knowing that the community is also involved in the transition and also all the PDPs that are about to start up. It's a concern for us to ensure that we have sufficient input and volunteers to be able to staff and receive community input on these processes.

This slide shows you the timeline and the process that goes for every review. Because we've been through four AoC reviews, we now essentially have developed a standard operating procedure. We've broken out the steps of each review so that we know what to expect from a timeline perspective and roughly what it takes to get all the way through the cycle, beginning with assembling the review team, to planning it, conducting, going to the board for action, and then implementing the recommendations that come up from the board, resolutions to adopt those recommendations.

Then the implementation process itself takes some time. For example, in the WHOIS Review Team, as one example, there was a recommendation to develop policy related to privacy and proxy services. So even if a review team is finished that might kick off a GNSO process that will still take several years to adopt.

Those are the things that I think the community has to understand. Review teams tend to kick off processes that may take several years to actually complete.

One of the things we wanted to highlight for the community was the composition of past review teams. As we've taken a look at the four review teams that have gone in the past, we tend to find that the concentration of review team members typically falls within the North American or European membership. We see that approximately 41% of review team members come from North America, 25% from Europe.

We really would like to see enhanced participation from other parts of the globe. For example, in the past, Africa has been 6%, Asia-Pacific has been 17%, and Latin America 11%. Part of what we're trying to do as staff in planning for the next one is to see what kind of outreach we can do to try to encourage people from other parts of the world to come into the ICANN community and try to participate in this effort.

There's also a distinction between the various supporting organizations and advisory committees because the review teams are typically set up so that there's representation from the advisory committees and supporting organizations that might be affected by the policy, and so you may be hearing this week with regards to the Consumer Choice and Trust review that

there are many groups that want to ensure that they have adequate participation in the membership.

The membership of Affirmation of Commitment reviews is typically done by the chairman of the GAC and either the ICANN CEO or the ICANN board of directors. They're the ones that actually take a look at the applicants and decide who will participate in that review team.

As I mentioned, the next one kicking off is the review of the new gTLD program. That will examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of new gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of the application process and the safeguards that were put in place to mitigate the issues that were involved in that expansion.

If you look at this mandate, it's fairly broad. One of the concerns we have is to make sure that we have members that not only represent the geographic diversity that I mentioned, but also have the expertise, so that in aggregate, the review team can cover all of these issues.

As I mentioned, the review team will look at the new gTLD program and its effect on these areas. There's been a tremendous amount of work underway at staff to really come up

with metrics and data to support this review team. We had a session this morning. I encourage you to take a look at the data that was shared in that session. It reflects approximately a three-year period where staff worked with the community to identify all kinds of metrics that might help support the way this review team might be conducted.

All of this now is published on our website. You can go there and you can see statistics about the number of applicants, where they're located, the number of registries and registrars, all kinds of information that will hopefully help this group determine whether there was a positive effect on competition in this program.

As I mentioned, we have on the slide the link for the call for volunteers. When the period is closed for the application process, we'll actually publish the list of applicants because part of the process is to identify whether these applicants will be representing a particular SO or AC.

In November, we'll be asking each of the supporting organizations and advisory committees to endorse the applicants that have indicated they would like to represent them. Once that is done, then Fadi and Thomas will get together and select the members of the review team.

As I mentioned, as this review team is going to look at a broad range of issues, we've tried to identify the kinds of skill sets that we're looking for. We're looking at individuals that have knowledge of the new gTLD program, also familiarity with our multi-stakeholder model and the way we try to develop consensus.

It's going to be important in this case to have representatives that can talk to consumer protection matters because it'll be a focus of this review team to see how consumers have been affected by the new gTLD program and new gTLDs.

We'll also be examining the rights protection mechanisms. So the URS and the trademark clearinghouse that was developed as part of the program, that will be under scrutiny in this review team. Someone with intellectual property experience would be definitely needed in this review team.

Also, security aspects. We'll be looking to see whether there were any security threats or problems as a result of the new gTLD program, and so people with expertise on malicious abuse and how to deal with it would also be needed in this review team.

As a big part of it is competition and market related issues, we actually have published just this month the economic study

produced by Catherine Tucker from MIT and the Analysis Group with Greg Rafert. There's a detailed analysis of whether there's been positive impacts on competition during this review team. I encourage you all to apply or find people who might have that expertise.

As I mentioned, this is the timeline. The call for volunteers will close in October. On November 2nd, we plan to publish the call for volunteers. During the month of November, we'll be going out to the supporting organizations and advisory committees to see whether they want to endorse the candidates.

In December, the review team will be selected, and then we anticipate that in January, they'll start their work. Given the past history, we are hopeful that they will publish their final report by the end of the year.

With that, I'll pass it to Larisa, who will talk to you about some of the organizational reviews under way.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Margie. Good morning. I'm glad to see you here at our review session.

In addition to the AoC reviews that Margie talked about, we have two reviews pertaining to the organizational reviews, which are

mandated by the bylaws that are currently under way. There is the GNSO review that's just about to wrap up, and then there is the review of the At-Large organization that's just about to get started.

But before I get into the details about those two reviews, I wanted to give you an overview of the organizational reviews, which work similarly to the AoC reviews, but there are key differences.

Organizational reviews are mandated by the ICANN bylaws. Article IV talks about specifically the independent nature of the reviews and the review cycle being every five years. The review is to be conducted by an independent entity, and that means independent of the organization being reviewed, independent of the board, and independent of the staff.

ICANN follows industry accepted competitive bidding practices and an RFP process to ensure that the selection of the independent examiner is such to result in an examiner that's truly independent, objective, and well qualified to perform the work.

The community under the review has an important role in this process. At the beginning of the process, they offer feedback on

the selection criteria for the independent examiner. You will see some examples of this shortly.

At the end of the review, they participate in the evaluation of how well the particular independent examiner delivered on their contract, and that input is really important because that determines whether a particular provider can participate in future work.

The interaction between the independent examiner and the organization under review, as well as the rest of the community, board, and staff is really important. We've ensured that there's multiple touch points through this process to keep the feedback loop consistent. However, at the end of the day, it is an independent report, and independent examiners generally reach their conclusions based on data and facts that they collect.

The organizational review process, as you can see, is quite similar to what Margie outlined for the AoC review. The primary difference is that this review, as I just described, is conducted by an independent examiner that gets hired to perform the work, as opposed to the AoC reviews, which are community led reviews.

Also, the cycle is different. Organizational reviews are on a five-year cycle, rather than a three-year cycle. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board (the OEC) of which Rinalia is the chair oversees the process of organizational reviews.

Now let's take a look at the GNSO review. This is the review that is wrapping up. As you can see, in September, the independent examiner, Westlake, delivered their final report.

Just a quick review of how we got to this point. The process started last year with the formation of the GNSO Review Working Party. That's the group that was appointed by the GNSO Council to serve as a liaison and provide input into the process, including criteria, various surveys, and the interview process. They also provided feedback at different points in time to the independent examiner as the independent examiner developed their findings and ultimately, their recommendations.

To give you an idea of the amount of work that goes into these reviews and the GNSO review in particular, the GNSO Working Party, which is comprised of about 20 members of the GNSO community, held 22 meetings. There were 24 public sessions across three ICANN meetings briefing the community on the progress and the findings.

The survey results accomplished 178 completed surveys, and in addition to that, there were 40 one-on-one interviews. This compared with an average of 71 surveys and 60 interviews in prior reviews, a substantial improvement that we were pleased to see.

With regard to the surveys, you can see here that the survey captured representation from across the community. Since this was the review of the GNSO community, not surprisingly, the majority of responses came from the GNSO community, but there is also significant input that came from other organizations. This is one of the reasons why we look at this as a holistic review and one that we refer to as a 360 in order to ensure that feedback is collected from different parts of the community.

The final report included 36 recommendations offered by Westlake Governance. The recommendations span these four different themes: participation and representation, transparency, continuous development, which also includes the policy development process, and alignment with ICANN's future.

The working party is currently looking at each of these recommendations and doing a feasibility assessment, as well as an assessment of prioritization of how these recommendations should be prioritized with the objective of delivering their views

on the specific recommendations to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. You will see the timeline for this shortly.

As the GNSO Review Working Party does this assessment, these are the various categories and frameworks that they consider in assessing each recommendation. They look at ease of implementation. They consider what kind of resources are needed to implement a given recommendation, and this would include both hard costs of acquiring systems or developing new applications, as well as time by community members in particular, as well as staff. They also look at how each recommendation aligns with the strategic direction of the GNSO and ICANN, and they also consider how the recommendation interacts or depends on other work within other communities or even within the GNSO.

Finally, in some cases, they look at recommend and they think about whether sufficient information has been presented or whether additional research and consideration is necessary in order to determine whether this is a useful and feasible recommendation.

The GNSO Working Party met here in Dublin and made excellent progress in this effort. They reviewed 27 recommendations out of the 36. They plan to have additional meetings in the next

month as they prepare to deliver their feasibility assessment and prioritization to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee for their consideration.

The whole point of looking at these various categories is to ensure that the recommendations, given the limited resources of everybody's time, that the recommendations that are prioritized are ones that can make the greatest impact in terms of improvements to the GNSO organization.

Another part of the improvement process that is being deployed by the GNSO Review Working Party is looking at what would represent a successful outcome. You heard Chris speak about this in the very beginning. With some recommendations, sometimes it's not clear what successful implementation would look like.

The GNSO Review Working Party and staff are considering what would constitute a successful outcome for any given recommendation – recommendations looking at criteria such as the recommendation being specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, and time bound. Can these things be done? How would they be measured? How long would it take to get them done?

Now for the next steps within the GNSO review. As I said, the review working party, which represents the GNSO voice is

completing their prioritization and the feasibility assessment, along with similar work that's being done by staff, and this information will be delivered to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee for their consideration in February. At that time, they will look at all the feedback received on the GNSO review, including public comments that were issued on the draft report, as they consider the next steps for the GNSO review recommendations.

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee then submits a recommendation to the full board of ICANN, and then the board would consider specific recommendations and actions towards implementation at their March meeting.

Now switching gears to the review of the At-Large organization, which is just at the planning phase. The noteworthy aspects of this review is that coming on the heels of the GNSO review. The process for this review really has the benefit of lessons learned and process improvements, which are being incorporated to make sure that the review process works better and considers all the items that we've learned recently through the other processes.

ALAC has appointed a review working party chaired by Holly Raiche to serve as the liaison between the At-Large community, the independent examiner that will eventually be selected, and

the board, as well as staff. That working party has a very important role right now to help frame the scope of work that will be conducted, to make sure that it's appropriately tailored to the At-Large organization. They're also looking at the important criteria to be used in selecting the independent examiner, as well as conducting evaluation of their organization.

The competitive bidding process will kick off in the December/January timeframe, and the independent examiner is expected to be appointed in March so that the official part of their review would start in April. The review would be conducted between April and approximately January timeframe, with the final report being delivered in January. Then board actions similar to what I outlined for the GNSO, the process would be very much similar to that.

The actual conduct of their review, of course, involves a number of steps. It involves collecting data through different methods that you will hear about in a few minutes. It involves ensuring that the independent examiner has factual and accurate information. It has multiple feedback loops between the community, the review working party, and the independent examiner to ensure that as they are findings and conclusions and recommendations are drafted, that they're based on factual and accurate information.

As far as the scope of work for this review, the intention is that it assesses the effectiveness of a few things. First, it's to take a look at the improvements that resulted from recommendations that were issued in the 2008 review. This is the second cycle of the At-Large review, similarly to the GNSO Review. There is the findings from the prior review, which have gone through implementations. The job of the independent examiner will be to assess how well those improvements have been implemented and whether they're working the way they were intended to.

The other aspect of the review is to look at the At-Large organization, and that's comprised of ALAC, the Regional At-Large Organizations (the RALOs) as well as the At-Large Structures (the ALSes).

It's important to note that the last review, which was conducted in 2008, only looked at the ALAC because at that time, the structure of the At-Large organization, including RALOs and ALSes, had just been formed, and it was too premature to look at the effectiveness of those structures. But now six years later, it's time to take a look at those organizations.

This assessment of effectiveness will be looked at relative to specified evaluation criteria, which you can see here. The evaluation criteria have been developed to be consistent across all the reviews. So as the independent examiners come in and

take a look at the GNSO or the At-Large organization, and eventually ccNSO and all the other structures, we want to make sure that they have a framework that's consistent and they apply an approach that is consistent and predictable to all the reviews.

The kinds of evaluation criteria that they look at is whether the organization is fulfilling its mission, how well it's adhering to its policies and procedures. They look at accountability and transparency to the public by the organization, as well as the membership processes that are in place to ensure that a broad and diverse group of community members participate or have the opportunity to participate in the process.

Of course, that involves communication and outreach, so those are also elements of the evaluation. How the governance and management of the group is conducted and how effectively they deliver on the work that they are chartered to do.

The review also looks at the evaluation and measurement of outcomes to make the assessment easier. How well does the organization reflect on its own progress and whether they measure their effectiveness?

As far as the methodology for the review, it will consist of several elements. Again, very similar to what was deployed for the GNSO

review. There will be an online survey that is intended to collect quantitative and qualitative elements that are a direct result of the evaluation criteria that we just looked at.

Those surveys will be open for completion, and we will invite the entire community to participate in providing their responses so that with this review, also, we can achieve a broad and diverse base of response, not just from the At-Large community, but from the entire ICANN community. There will also be feedback from members of the At-Large community.

We just talked about the fact that participation is welcome from anybody that engages with the At-Large community and has a point of view on how they're working. The independent examiner will also observe proceedings. We expect that they will participate in ICANN meetings and actually observe firsthand how some of this works. There will be one-on-one interviews with the leadership of the At-Large organizations and various other people that would be selected specifically to provide a viewpoint on an area of evaluation that we just reviewed.

Finally, the independent examiner is expected to review and analyze the vast amount of documents and records that are available on the At-Large website and ICANN as a whole.

So, how do we select the independent examiner? The bylaws call for an independent review. The primary objective is to select an examiner who is independent, objective, and knowledgeable.

Here, you see the various criteria that have been defined to ensure that as proposals come in as part of the competitive bidding process, it's an open competitive bidding process that will be announced. It will include very specific details for what we want to see as part of the proposals. The details of what's included in the proposals is designed to illustrate competency, independence, and objectivity based on the factors that you see here on the screen.

It's not by chance that area number two is the biggest. That's the biggest block because the most important element of selecting an independent examiner is ensuring that someone has appropriate knowledge and expertise to carry out the work that's ahead of them.

While these are the criteria that are used to do the evaluation, the evaluation is done by a core team within ICANN consisting of people from our procurement and legal teams, as well as the functional area, which is the Strategic Initiatives Team. The core team reviews all the proposals scoring every proposal based on very specific criteria that are derived from this list that you see in front of you.

There's also an advisory group that's comprised of members of the OEC (the Organizational Effectiveness Committee) and the working party, and they provide advice to make sure that the selected independent examiner meets all the desired qualifications.

So at this point, for a discussion of implementation of prior review recommendations, I will turn that over to Margie again.

MARGIE MILAM:

This part of the presentation, I will walk you through some of the implementation activities related to the prior reviews. It's very important for us to ensure that the community is aware of where we are in these reviews and the timeline for completing them, so on our website, we actually publish on a quarterly basis updated reports that will provide you with milestones and deliverables for each recommendation for all of the review teams that have taken place in the past. We're constantly trying to ensure that the work gets done in a timely manner and meets the expectations of the community.

As we mentioned earlier, sometimes it's difficult to determine though how to evaluate a particular recommendation to see whether it's completed and we can check it off as being complete. One example is, in the WHOIS Review Team. There

was a recommendation to develop a privacy and proxy accreditation program.

So when we're managing this process, we ask ourselves, so when is that complete? Is it complete when the PDP gets kicked off, when the PDP's concluded and the board adopts it, when it's implemented? There's many ways that you could look at a particular recommendation and determine where the final point is for completion, so sometimes there's a little bit of uncertainty as to what the review team was looking for and when we can consider it complete.

If you actually go to our Wiki page, for each recommendation, you'll see the milestones that are associated with it, the percentage completion, and who's responsible for them. Some of the recommendations typically involve, not just staff work, but board work or even community work, and so it's quite a task to develop the expertise and manage this huge project of implementing the recommendations for every review team.

This is just an example of some of the information we have on our website. For the ATRT2 (the second one) there were 12 recommendations that were broken down into 51 components and 117 milestones. Each of those have due dates and are tracked and we try to provide that information to the

community so that the community is aware of where we are in any given implementation.

If you go to our website, you'll actually see that we actually break it down by recommendation. There's a page for each specific recommendation and the actual milestones and delivery dates and whether they're complete or not. I encourage you all if you have interest in how we're doing on any particular recommendation to take a look at our Wiki pages for that.

We're also constantly trying to improve the way that we present this information. We've been doing some research internally to see whether we can find a more interactive tool that will help the community understand where we are with these. We're really hopeful that we'll come up with something that'll present the information in a better and easier way to review.

Again, the question we have as we're going forward with the next review team is to help them understand what we're looking for when it comes to the recommendations and how they're drafted. Obviously, there's multiple parties that are involved in determining whether the recommendation is to be implemented and how it's to be implemented, so we're looking for recommendations that can be specific and measurable. There's something there where it's very clear as to what the

community's looking for, and that it's realistic to get done, it's feasible and within the resources that are available.

Also, it's helpful to know when the review team expects the work to be done because sometimes the expectations between staff and the community may be very different. It may take quite a bit longer to produce some of the recommendations and actually complete the project.

One example is the WHOIS accuracy reporting system that we're building that stemmed from the 2012 WHOIS Review Team. Well, we're still in development on that, and it'll take probably another couple months before we finally complete the work with respect to that recommendation.

With that, I'll pass it to Larisa who will talk to you about some of the lessons learned and how we intend to include those in the upcoming reviews.

LARISA GURNICK:

Lessons learned. This is an important area. As with anything that we do at ICANN, it's important to stop and reflect. What worked well? What hasn't worked as well? Where is there an opportunity for continued improvement? It is a continuous improvement process.

Most recently, we've taken a look at how the various AoC reviews were conducted and how the implementation process worked, as well as we've taken a look at the most recent GNSO review and had extensive discussions with the community, within staff and board.

These are highlights of lessons learned that have been collected from all these different feedback mechanisms. What you see here is really six themes that summarize the important lessons learned.

Community buy-in is essential for successful implementation of improvements. It's also essential for a successful conduct of the review itself. As Margie highlighted earlier, community members are involved in so many different capacities.

In the case of AoC reviews, you are involved as part of the review team. Community is certainly involved in terms of providing feedback through public comments and various other survey mechanisms and feedback loops. It's essential that not only does community buy in to the process, but also has the time to focus on some of these really important issues.

Number two is feedback loop and measurable improvements. We understand that in order to be able to engage people to devote their precious time to this process, which is so important

to ICANN’s accountability, it’s really important to be able to see measurable improvements from that process. That’s why we have so much focus on outcomes that are measurable and ability to report back what has been accomplished as a result of all this work because that is the ultimate objective is to make improvements and make things work better.

The third area is linking the review outputs to the strategic planning efforts that go on at ICANN. Recently there have been discussions that what’s important is feedback loops going both ways. Reviews feeding the strategic planning efforts, as well as the strategic planning efforts feeding the reviews.

The fourth area is that reviews of individual organizations should align with ICANN core values and strategic direction, which really builds on the prior item.

Planning is incredibly important, and we use the word “thoughtfully” here to indicate that all of our plans are based on certain standard expectations of how long things take. But we’re building into our planning process the flexibility to react when necessary to changes in timelines and really be mindful, keeping our eyes always on the resources that the community can dedicate to this activity because if there is not sufficient focus and resources, this process really doesn’t work as effectively as it’s intended to.

Finally, implementation plans. All the work that leads up to recommendations is incredibly important, but what happens to those recommendations next is equally important. You'll hear about some very specific process improvements that will ensure that when the implementation work begins, everybody's really clear on what the outcome of that implantation will be, how we will measure it, how long it will take, what are the milestones, what are the timelines so that this will all result in a much more productive and effective implementation process.

While the prior slide highlighted themes, what I want to talk about here is some of the practical applications of those themes and things that we're also doing to apply these lessons learned immediately to the review planning and the work that's underway.

Two areas that I'd like to highlight, for example, budget management and cost tracking. This is actually something that came out of the recommendation of ATRT2 to ensure that the review teams have early information about the budget and the resources that are available for the review team. So building on that theme, we're developing tools and guidelines to help the review teams not only understand what budgets they have to work within, but also the ability to monitor and track that with the assistance from staff of course.

The other area that I want to highlight is the fifth item. Designating several review team members to be involved in the implementation planning and periodic assessment. Because it's challenging to arrive at that clarity that Margie talked about, we feel that it's very important to have representatives from the review teams actually work with staff and other community members in developing the implementation plans and providing additional clarifications and helping sort through questions that might arise once people start looking at more specific plans and actions.

By having that continuity from the review team, or in the case of organizational reviews, it would be the review working party, working hand in hand with people that are actually responsible for the implementation. We will make sure that early on in the process the spirit of the recommendation is clearly articulated and reflected in the implementation plans.

This idea was also presented to the community in the recent public comment process that was associated with reviews, and we've received very positive feedback on that process improvement, so that's getting implemented immediately. As well as, we feel it would be useful to have review team members be involved in some sense in periodic assessments of whether we're on track or not, so that we can start bridging the gap

between people’s understanding or expectations of what constitutes a successful implementation.

Finally, I just want to flag for all of you that there is a new relaunched section of the ICANN website that deals with these reviews. We realize that reviews are very process intensive. There’s a lot of timelines, a lot of different acronyms that spell out different groups that are involved in this process, and there’s just an enormous volume of documents. They’re all really important, but sometimes it’s hard to see the forest through the trees.

The idea with the new webpages was to make information easier to find to offer opportunities for the community to drill down and get more information as you would like more information, but also to be able to come up to a higher level and get the essence of why the reviews are so important and what’s happening within the reviews area at a high level. I encourage all of you to check out these new pages. You can find them under the resources tab.

What you see here is the landing page for the accountability section, and from that, you can access any of these topics and the reviews that we just highlighted. This is just the beginning of our improvements to the website pertaining to the reviews, so we very much encourage feedback for ways that we can improve

this and make it a more useful experience for everybody in finding the information that you're seeking.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. That was a lot of information to absorb, and now we'd really like to hear from you. Essentially, what we're looking for is suggestions on improvements. Fiona, I'm going to call on you. Please come up to the microphone.

FIONA ASONGA: First of all, I just want to get a clarification. I would like us to go back to slide number eight where you list the participation of different stakeholders in the review process. You've put a category of other, and there is something else on the extreme – right there. There is the ex officio and there is other. Who are the other? Can you explain a bit who those are? That's my first issue.

Then the second, I think moving forward in view of what is happening within ICANN right now with the IANA transition and all, we probably need to re-look at some of our structures. I have been going through the website and all the material available in the public domain on ICANN. I'm not getting any guidelines of how structural reviews can be done.

If, for example, we feel that a particular constituency is not sitting correctly. I think in the interest of being able to properly present both the multi-stakeholder perspective of what ICANN does, it's important that we clearly identify some of the constituencies and not lump them with others.

I am from the numbers community. In the numbers community, we have issues on online security, for example, that you need to engage with the ISP constituency. But the ISP constituency is not clearly visible and identifiable within our structure. So, if you're looking for the ISP, you have to go into the names.

You're looking for network operators and carriers because probably you have numbering issues that you want to discuss with them, we are forced to go and look for them in the names space. They are hidden somewhere inside the names, and reaching to them and being able to engage them becomes very difficult because of the way that structure works. The process of requesting for their input ends up having to come in as a GNSO issue, as opposed to just that [inaudible].

What I'm basically saying is we need to restructure our GNSO so that it is more effective. I think it is not effective. I have looked at a lot of the challenges we've had, even in trying to work through the transition process, and it's very clear that there are a lot of heavy internal conflicts within the GNSO. Now we're opening it

up to the global community. It's going to be a mess if we don't restructure it correctly.

I've been trying to engage the ISP [inaudible] I realized there's very little participation from Africa and from Asia because when they come in, you're hiding somewhere in the names. When you start looking at the issue, the discussion, yes, it's important, but there's a lot more that that constituency can do for both the names and the numbers and be involved in both policies for the names and the numbers that gives ICANN a lot more credibility as being able to really accommodate the voices of all.

I think the current GNSO structure downplays some of the voices, and as a result, voices still sprout out from the community in directions, so you're trying to figure out what is the issue. My analysis of some of the issues is because we are not giving enough voice to some of the constituencies. Visibility of each constituency comes with responsibility with the power to be heard and all the rest.

The biggest gift that ICANN has for the global community is the ability for anyone coming in to be heard in their respective constituencies. I'm basically appealing for a structural review, but I don't know where to start.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Fiona. I think you came to the right place. There are three parts to the issues that you raised. On the question of other, I'll let Larisa or Margie handle that.

On the visibility of the ICANN structure itself, I hear you. I think what you're saying is that you wanted access to a specific constituencies, and you were not able to get that information on the ICANN space. You wanted feedback or input from them, but somehow, they cannot independently do that to support your work in the Numbers community, and it comes out as a GNSO position, and that is challenging for you.

I want to say that yesterday the board had a meeting with the Commercial Stakeholder Group, and the ISP (the Internet Service Provider) constituency also raised the issue that the structure is not working for them. Our response for the Organizational Effectiveness Committee is that we would like to have a dialog to find out the issues in terms of where the structure is not working in order to start looking into the process, and we'll move from there.

Do you want to hear about the other first before you follow up?
Yes. Go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: To answer your question about the other category on that slide, it's the independent experts that aren't trying to be representing any of the SOs and ACs.

FIONA ASONGA: A follow-up to the meeting you had, maybe to just help really for us to understand the scenario, in Africa, we buy a lot of cars from Japan. The Japanese cars come in with parts that you can interchange from one car to another. You have a Toyota, but you can add in Nissan parts, and it will still work, and [inaudible] you wait for the right part to be shipped in.

Now what we have done to the GNSO is we've taken the car, we've put in all these different parts. The Subaru part is in the Toyota. The Nissan part is in the Toyota. They're all Japanese parts.

Then we wanted to look really posh and decided to take the branding of the Mercedes Benz and put it on top. You no longer have a Toyota. Yes, you have a car. It sort of functions, and then you're no longer waiting for the parts to be shipped in. You're like, "This is a permanent state."

That is where I think we have put our GNSO, so we need to ensure that the right parts are in. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. The visualization is always valuable. Another thing that I wanted to add in the discussion that we had yesterday is apart from looking at the structural construct, one concrete way of addressing it is in our meeting strategy where we look at issues by theme or topic. Then the relevant parties, no matter where they are situated, can come in and gather around those issues, and that is one way of addressing it.

Thank you for nodding. Other questions or comments? Please.

PRANESH PRAKASH: Pranesh Prakash from the Center for Internet and Society. I'm just pulling up stats about Internet users in the world right now, and it seems to me 47.8 of the Internet users in the world right now are from Asia. Whereas, 9.6% is from North America. Now I don't see that being reflected in that graph. Half the world is female, more actually than half the world, and yet, I don't see that being reflected in the graph.

What concrete steps are being taken to make these changes is one question. On the first question, just to make clear, it's not just a future-looking problem that the next billion – I keep hearing – are going to come from the developing world. No. Already the majority of the population on the Internet are from

the developing world. So it's a current problem, not a future problem [not] about how we solve it. One is that.

The second – I'm sorry, I came in very late, nearly at the end, so this may already have been discussed. But I was curious post the transition, my understanding is that the Affirmation of Commitments is going to remain with a single government. Would you be able to comment about this and say whether that understanding is correct? What actually is going to happen post transition and think about the future of the AoC?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Pranesh. I'll take this on. I'll answer your second question first.

In terms of the Affirmation of Commitment, it will be transferred into the ICANN bylaws. We are essentially saying that these reviews are important for ICANN's accountability, and we commit to continue doing that with some improvements to refine focus etc.

Do you have a follow up on that point?

PRANESH PRAKASH: Yes. If I understand that response correctly, that means the AoC ...

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Reviews. The reviews under the Affirmation of Commitments.

PRANESH PRAKASH: Okay. So the reviews will be rolled into the bylaws, but the AoC as a document, will it continue remaining after the transition, and if so, will it remain an affirmation between ICANN, as a body, and the US Department of Commerce as the other signatory to this?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: As I understand it, if the transition is successful, it will not be present anymore. ICANN will be an independent organization. It will not be tied to the US government in that way.

Theresa wanted to comment, and don't forget his first question about diversity concrete steps.

THERESA SWINEHART: Let me just follow on this first. As you know, within the context of the CCWG, there's a lot of discussion around the incorporation into the bylaws, and so once the bylaws are in place and once those have all been agreed upon, then ICANN and NTI would

enter into discussions on how to sunset the AoC appropriately. That's where we would have it as a processed end point.

With regards to the engagement – and I'll turn it over to Margie on that one – but just a few observations. You're flagging an important area, and there's been tremendous efforts with our teams in the regions, as well to ensure that we have participants and also the ease of getting the information out, and so there's awareness around that. I'll let Margie talk to some of the concrete steps, but we're always very receptive to any additional suggestions on that and partnering with different groups to help with that area. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM:

Yes. With respect to the consumer choice review that's coming up, I've been working with the Global Engagement Team. We actually made a presentation to the India Stakeholder Group to try to get the word out about this, and they're sending it out to their newsletters, as well.

I think part of what you're seeing here is because the requirement is that some of them represent the SOs and ACs and we are seeking endorsements from the SOs and ACs, that in a sense, there's a limited pool of people that are actually even considered. So by increasing the engagement to try to increase

the number of people that apply and by highlighting the disparity here, we're hoping that we can get the attention of the SOs and ACs that hopefully will recommend people that can at least provide a broader spectrum of global participation because for us, it's certainly important to see those numbers changing.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Essentially, it has to be a bottom-up initiative to include diversity. Please?

TOM MCKENZIE: Tom McKenzie from ITEMS International in Paris, consultancy firm. I arrived also very late. Apologies for that. But did you in your presentation announce all the upcoming reviews, and if so, I would be very interested to see that list – the calendar for all the reviews and also a calendar for when you're going to be publishing the RFPs for those.

Oh, there they are. Great. Thank you very much.

MARGIE MILAM: The slides are already posted. On the session, you'll see the actual dates. For the AoC Reviews, the very start date is the call for volunteers. For the CCT and the SSR and the WHOIS, it would

be the call for volunteers. I believe for the organizational reviews, for the RSSAC and SSAC, that's an earlier point. I'll ask Larisa to address that.

LARISA GURNICK:

For the At-Large review, the RFP will be posted in January. That's the next coming up. The other reviews are slightly out there in terms of the schedule, but that will start the process. Usually, the RFP process is accompanied with an announcement on the ICANN website, as well as all the details for how to apply and what should be included in the RFP. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Other questions and comments? No. Okay. Going once. Going twice.

With that, thank you very much. We'll close the session now. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]