
MONTREAL – At-Large Leadership session: ATRT 3 & NomCom Review Leadership Team
Sunday, November 3, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Are we recording? Thank you very much. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I hang around this room and a few others from time to time, but I'm sitting here with an entirely different couple of hats on in this session, and Maureen maintains she didn't need to moderate me. I think she just wants to have a lunch actually, so I'm self moderating, this as an exercise in self moderation.

I'm here with Co-Chairs and leadership team abound. I've got the Co-Chair with ATRT3, I'm so tempted to say your name wrong just on principle, Pat Kane, and we're going to take you through some of our slides and material to do with where we think we are and where we're going with our reporting and our work on the accountability and transparency review team.

And we've got Tom Barrett, who has shared with Vander and a number of you in the room the thrill packed and exciting world of the nominating committee review and now we're up to the implementation working group about the nominating committee review. And so he and I will tag team on that and the he may or may not turn up, depending on when he's landing.

So with that, you're putting up with me to help you digest your dinners, or perhaps not digest your dinners, as the case may be. And we'd like this to be both parts as interactive as open and almost fun as possible.

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.

So, please do use the traditional method if you're around the table of popping your tent card up if you would like to pose a question. We have speaking microphones in two positions and we welcome anyone in the audience to also ask a question or make a comment.

With that, I will remind you that we run with simultaneous translations in the At-Large Advisory Committee room. And so if you do not speak English, French and Spanish, it might be wise of you to get a piece of equipment from the back of the room, which, if you plug in your ears, or your own private ones, if you're like me, you will be able to hear the interpretation when people use a language you are not familiar with. To make that job easier for everybody, if you would please be so kind as to speak slowly, as clearly and as articulately as you can, and indeed, if you can avoid the use of colloquialisms, so I have to stop being an Australian, it's very difficult for me to manage, ICANN assure you.

But the other thing that we would request you do is name yourself if you take the microphone. So, you'll hear me say Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record pretty much every time we take a microphone, well, at least when I do, I won't say when you do, and I would encourage you to do the same.

So, with that, I think we filibustered enough to get most of the key folk through the lunch group and we have our first slide up and as long as you remember, if you're going to move a microphone closer to you pick it up and move it in the straight line, don't move it left or right, these recording video apparatuses are keyed onto the back of these microphones, so they expect to go to a certain position when a certain microphone is pushed and activated.

And please don't have the mic open when you drag it across the table, I don't know about anybody else, but my ear drums, don't need that sort of experience and I suspect that the IT guys grimace, absolutely grimace, when they have that happen, nor do we need to tap them when you're at the standing mics, if it doesn't work, then look pleadingly to the back of the room on bended knee if needs be, but the boys are here to help, and they will.

Let's have a look at where we're taking you with ATRT3. We're going to give you a little bit of background on what at ATRTs are all about and what we're all about. In particular, we're going to briefly tell you about the sources of information and the topics that we have been assessing. We're going to dig in a little bit to do with the ATRT2 recommendation and the implementation reports regarding those ATRT2 recommendations. We're going to talk about the survey and thank you all for contributing so much valuable information and data points for our use in that. We will probably have a moment but not too much more about the ICANN accountability indicators. I might do a pop quiz to see how many of you have looked at them recently or if any of you know what they are.

Next slide please. And we'll be talking about Prioritization, Reviews., Diversity on the Board, Public consultations, the Policy Development Process, and other good stuff like what we might be doing in Next Steps. Pat and I will tag team this and that means that I think I've probably done my dash, and this next bit is over to you, good sir.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. This is Pat. So, one of the things that we're dealing with for the first time, is the updated operating standards for the reviews. And one of the biggest changes there is really how we formulate recommendations and take a look at recommendations versus suggestions. So if we can get to the next slide, please. The areas that we have to cover is, of course, identifying the recommendation, defining the desired outcomes including any metrics that we would recommend to achieve the goal, identification of potential problems and attaining the data or developing the metric, and then put together a timeframe with which we think that these recommendations need to be bound.

Next slide. So continuing, any baselines that we currently have or identify, any data that is that is possessed by ICANN or the ICANN community, any industry metrics that we can use that are specific to the topic, community input, taking a look at any surveys or studies, and then to achieve consensus upon that recommendation. So, ATRT2 recommendations, they completed this work in December 2013, with 12 recommendations, 46 components, the majority of the recommendations were focused on the Board and the GAC. The implementation of ATRT2 recommendations began in 2014 and it was reported as completed in 2018. One of the things that we're responsible to do an ATRT3 is to go back and take a look at that and take a look at that assessment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. This is a little bit of history. ATRT3 is the only time bound by bylaw specific review. And so we have 12

months to operate in. So, we held our first meeting quite appropriately. I believe now, on April Fool's Day in 2019, therefore we must complete our work by March 30th in 2020. And yes, we know this was a review team that should have been running earlier, but there was a lot of good reasons for it not to and it all had to do with the bylaws and transition. That said, ATRT3 was originally composed of 18 members, we've had a little bit of attrition and if you just scroll up slowly, I don't know why there's so much real estate devoted to multiple topics and not the actual presentation, but anyway, and you'll see what the breakdown was. We had four people and we still have four people serving on your behalf of the At-Large community.

Let's move on. One thing we might just do before we do that, because I see him, those of you who may know, we did have the privilege of having Maarten as our Board member but Maarten, of course, has now taken up the mantle of being the Vice Chair before he steps into the Chair of the Board and in case you don't know, they've been very, very sensible in the selection of the Board member that they've given to ATRT3 to work with. I know you won't know this name but if Mr. Sanchez is in the room, Leon was the replacement. So we're delighted to have Leon as now our member and he is a member this time, not a liaison, a member of ATRT3, Leon is replacing Maarten. So I think most of you will be pleased to see that is also the case as well. Now we can scroll, welcome Leon.

We going to be making, based on what you heard from Pat, less recommendations and perhaps a little more in the line of suggestions and in some cases very strong suggestions in our final report. That

doesn't mean that we expect the suggestions to be ignored, definitely not. But we will be trying to limit our recommendations to the topics which we believe are of critical importance, including things that are the most timely to manage and if we can move to the next slide please. I think this is back to you, good sir.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl, if we could scroll down two more slides. Take a look at ATRT3 recommendations. So when we as a team went through all the ATRT2 recommendations which were actually reported as 100% complete by ICANN Org, what we identified from our own assessment was that 50% were completely implemented, 29% were partially implemented, and 18% were not implemented.

Some of the wording in the recommendations coming out of ATRT2 was very prescriptive. And so we took an absolute view on whether the recommendation itself was met regardless of whether it was solved in a different manner. So, you know, some of the ones that were not implemented were based upon not necessarily nothing being done, but something was done, but was different than what was recommended. Next slide, please.

So take a look at the ATRT3 survey, we conducted two surveys, one was for structures and one was for individual respondents; 15 of 17 SOs, ACs and constituency bodies and RALOs responded to the survey and 88 individuals were 50 answered all the questions.

Next slide. The strongest responses and the biggest prioritization in terms of taking a look at what was most clear within the survey was

around Prioritization, Specific and Organizational Reviews, Diversity of Board members, Public comment process, Support for Board decisions. It was interesting to see that prioritization and the organizational reviews were so strong, because that really is a big topic that's going on in different areas in different reviews throughout the community. Next slide, please.

So, given the strong support for Board decisions. We decided it was not included as an issue for ATRT3 to consider. The GNSO policy development process and its assessment on ATRT2 recommendations was, but the list of priority topics that we came up with that we're going to address is Prioritization, Specific and Organizational Reviews, again, not a surprise, Diversity of Board members, PDPs, and the Public comment process. Thank you, Cheryl for that sigh, it was nice.

Alright, accountability indicators we're taking a look at, Cheryl was going to give you a quiz earlier to see we actually knew what those were.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Who has ever looked at the ICANN accountability, come on, be honest, how many of you look at the ICANN accountability? Well of course, Olivier does, of course you do, okay, well, yes, more than I expected, that's pretty good, well, we're just a rare group in this room. I think if we did it in many rooms we wouldn't get that many which I think was about seven people.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl, this is Pat. We can go to Prioritization. So when we asked the survey question around prioritization, it was overwhelmingly responsive from both the individuals and the structures that it should be something that ATRT3 takes a look at. Similar focus and responses to the public comment on the evolving multistakeholder model as well, which is, of course, Brian Cote's effort.

ATRT3, we're currently awaiting some additional information from the Board. The Board is also taking a look at prioritization. Avri has been running a document we took, we got a preview of the document last week, all the review team Chairs, in terms of what that looks like and we provided some feedback and we'll get some more input on that and work that into our process, but not to overlap in terms of what's being done there. So we take a look at reviews. So, when we consider specific reviews, it's the first time that we've seen, recommendations coming from a review team end up with assignment to different groups, some accepted, and some put onto a pending status.

So, Jonathan, I know that this is something that we learned from you very clearly in terms of what's changing and how we should consider what we're doing within ATRT3. And since the review teams have again significantly increased requirements in terms of making the recommendations, something that we need to consider from how we look at reviews actually driving those recommendations. Next slide please.

So we took a look at how would you rate the effectiveness of the specific reviews again across ATRT, SSR, RDS, et cetera, there was some dissatisfaction that we found in terms of the effectiveness of those

particular reviews. And again, when we asked those specific reviews be reconsidered or amended, overwhelming support from both structures and from individuals. Next slide.

So we took a look at organizational reviews, considering that we're having specific reviews on SOs and ACs. We got again additional information that there was dissatisfaction and that the organizational reviews should either be amended or reconsidered. So in taking all of that, we took a look and said, okay, from a review standpoint, what is ATRT3 trying to solve for?

And when we broke it down into the areas that we're looking at in terms of issues, these are the issues that we're dealing with: Lack of coordination and overlap between reviews sometimes results in conflicting recommendations. There are many reviews. We all have to compete for ICANN's resources in terms of implementation, as well as doing the review. Lack of time or lack of resources. Failure to properly implement some recommendations and report out on those. And difficulty in addressing a systemic or holistic view of all the component pieces in aggregate. Next slide, please.

So, one of the questions we had we want to address with you today is taking a look at some of the considerations that we're looking at for a recommendation. We've been talking about taking a look at a single, so, replace all specific reviews with one review, all organizational reviews with a single review, have a single review for everything, or taking a look at how do we assess other things and reviews that should not be considered anymore. Do we need an additional CCTRT review or

that nature, and then at some point in time declare that that not be there.

But we're having a conversation and we don't have consensus within our group itself in terms of do we collapse, I'm sorry Sebastian, I'm just aware we wanted to use, but if we pushed reviews together for certain topics or do we keep them in a similar structure to how we are today, so that we end up with a greater set of recommendations around accountability and transparency, or do we try to consolidate the work and come up with fewer set of recommendations that are implementable. Did you want to add anything to that Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. One of the things that we are particularly aware of is that some out of the box thinking might be needed on this. So we are keen to get your ideas. These are just some of our ideas that we could get enough carriage and support for to put on the slide. So, we're not locked in here into any of this thinking, but this is an example of some thinking that might stimulate some of your thinking on this.

What we do know is it's not working the way it is and an ATRT is one of the few, if only, opportunities for a change to be made to specific organizational reviews. So, it is our opportunity and it's our work to do. So if you would like to see change, please help us now look at what might be suitable I do see a queue starting, so perhaps we could pause just briefly and let them mull over this. It was Olivier and then Eduardo. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was part of the ATRT2 review team which was a lot of work, and I absolutely appreciate the work that you guys are doing at ATRT3 which is probably the reason why I did not volunteer for ATRT3, knowing how much work was involved. A couple of things.

First, you touched on the survey about reviews and the perception of reviews in the ICANN community, if I can understand correctly, and you know the statistics are helpful, of course, but sometimes the answers that are given, and when you just give a whole percentage of respondents that supported reviews did not support reviews, et cetera, sometimes it's for very different reasons. You know, some people are saying that reviews are pointless, others are saying reviews might not be pointless, but they're not having an impact on ICANN. And some are saying that it's just talk because there's no implementation of it afterwards. And one thing that did concern me was the slide which you had a little bit earlier, reviewing ATRT2 recommendations and their status, the state of implementation. Could we just roll back to this briefly?

Because we had the same thing and ATRT2 had to review ATRT1 recommendations. And the general concern in the group was that the numbers that we were given as to the number of recommendations that were implemented fully was rather low. And here we're seeing that 53% I can go a bit faster than the scroll, but 53% have actually been implemented. That's half of the recommendations, in how many years? Five years, five years, and then there are quite a few that are far from

being implemented and in fact I think that some of them were not implemented at all, 18% that's a fifth of them, basically, if my math is correct, nearly a fifth of them, and I'm really concerned about this, because we keep on having one review after another, but the implementation of the hard work that is done there is not going through.

We have no idea how much of the ATRT1 recommendations have been implemented by now, or have you reviewed that as well? Perhaps we haven't, no, because we had terrible numbers last time. So now these ones have dropped. Now we're going into these ones we're seeing 53% only completely implemented. Why, why are we there? Have you looked at this and are we going to take action about that? Because I'm seeing at the moment, an ever continuing, self perpetuating machine where we just keep on doing another review on the previous review, and another one, and nothing changes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, did you want to respond to that? Because I just see that as a definition of why we're doing what we're doing.

PAT KANE: Sure, thank you Cheryl, this is Pat. So, Olivier, I think that we didn't do a detailed analysis on the why's, we certainly had conversations about the why's. Six years ago we were in a scenario under the affirmation of commitments, we're in a different environment today. So I think that there's some that could be contributed to that. There's some that we had to go back and try to rebuild what the intent was in the ATRT2

recommendations and I think that that is part of the challenge and what did you mean six years ago. And we try to recreate as much as possible, try to get a feel for, it did it meet the intent, if it didn't meet the actual words. So we've done some of that.

And we've talked and very briefly about trying to separate the value of the review team and the implementation of the recommendations that come out of that, because I think that what we're seeing is there's dissatisfaction with the implementation of what the community has said is an issue. We even talked about, again, very briefly, and this is not a consensus position for the review team, to where maybe there's a role for ATRT3 members to continue through and pay attention to the implementation so that we don't lose the focus on what our intent was.

Now that's a broader commitment beyond the year timeframe, but it's something to think about in terms of making certain that what we meant is what gets implemented or gets retired. You know, when we talk about prioritization there's a lot of recommendations that come out and at some point in time, we're not going to be able to get all of them done. So what's the retirement process for some of those recommendations, as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, so queue at this stage, we'll go to Eduardo next, and then I believe we have Alan, Sébastien, Jonathan, the floor mic and I think we'll hold it at that, so we can complete and move on to of course what Tom needs to work with us, as well. Eduardo, over to you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Cheryl. The question I have is about reviews that you were saying that they were thinking about categorizing them or doing it a different way. I just wanted to know if you have taken into consideration also that sometimes these reviews, they take so long that at the end they start another review, so they will be reviewing...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl for the record. Time binding is an important part of what we recognize is a problem. How much time is still up to date. We've got theories that say it should be, lock people in a room for three days and let them out when they've got it sorted. Others think a year is being tested. It may be an arbitrary figure, but to have some form of time binding, we're certainly considering that as important, but we also need to recognize and this is from Brian's work as well as our own, that the effectiveness and efficiencies you get often come from the scoping and so properly well scoped things also make life easier. Alan, then Sebastian.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, I'm going to focus on the same numbers that Olivier talking about, but taking a very different position. I'm not particularly perturbed if something that was recommended N years ago was not implemented. The world changes, the Board should be doing prioritization and saying it made a lot of sense to them, but really it's not high on our list.

What does bother me is the contrast between those two bullets, that is, the decision to not fully implement was not a decision, it was the

assessment of ICANN Org internally that it had been completed, and it wasn't, and in some cases, blatantly so, because there are some cases where nothing was done, but there's a green tick. That part really worries me because it puts into question the whole principle of having these reviews.

If we're making recommendations and somebody is covering their, forgive me the expression, is covering their butts of saying, yes we did it, and yet, when you guys come in and just like I did with my team and the RDS review and say that was never done. How did you put a tick mark there? That part worries me far more, because it really questions why the something are we bothering to do this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, trying not to smile too loudly, it's not that I don't believe and understand and agree with everything you've said, but it is very much one of the questions we are asking ourselves, and there is text being drafted to hopefully stimulate some solutions. We have Sébastien and then we have Jonathan, nope, Sébastien is out, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Jonathan Zuck for the record. Yes, I did get to experience the first ever post affirmation commitments Board response to recommendations, and I know that was just bad timing, but I'm concerned about the implementation question that has been raised, but I'm also concerned about the proposal you had up on the screen when you opened it up for questions about consolidation into a single review,

simply because I think, right, I think that scoping, as you say, is one of the most critical issues and I know there was a recommendation floating around at the transition and I thought that it had come up again, about the ATRT playing a role in launching reviews in a timely manner and that seems to me like a better idea than doing some kind of a consolidation, so that it's still a separate review.

I think the structure of reviews being open to the entire community instead of being so GNSO focused is critically important, it's like one of the few sort of uses of the entire empowered community, if you will, to have direct access to the Board in that way with those recommendations. But then, making them clearly defined, maybe even the ATRT is involved in generating the Charter for that instance of the review or something like that.

But creating a mechanism like that will allow us to have something that's topical, set a scope that's narrow, set a limit on recommendations, get prioritization to happen by the review team, et cetera, and that feels more dynamic and has more chance to succeed than just creating a giant thing that is generating 40 recommendations and 20% of them get, I mean, there's not any point in that. To Alan's point, it makes sense that that might happen, but it also makes sense not to create a world in which we assume that's going to happen. Why don't we try to narrow scope, make things focused and implementable in the near term and have that process be dynamic?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. Thanks, Jonathan, and as you know it's shorthand on slides. The terminology that we're using an awful lot in our discussion is nearly always coupled with continuous improvement programs, as well, and when you put that as a possible dynamic in, that also changes some of the opportunities, as well. Because if you have continuous improvement programs running on some of these things it gives different levers to operate. So, we're very excited to watch this space, but thank you for that input, that's been really valuable.

BILL: This is Bill [inaudible] for the record. You mentioned that the assessment of whether something was done was based on did they do exactly what was in the recommendation or not, and I think it would be really helpful to break out was the problem addressed in some other fashion, or was it just not addressed. If you have 18% that wasn't done and 17% was done in some other fashion, that's very different than only 1% was done in some other fashion.

PAT KANE: This is Pat, thank you for that question and comment. We did have that conversation when we went through the questions and Bernie you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we had one, maybe two that we specifically talked about that were solved in a different manner in terms of something was done. Five? Bernie's telling me five, so apparently I was asleep during that part of the review, Singapore's a long way. But it was not very many that there were, is the point. But we did consider that and take a look at that. But we opted to have a consistent review

of saying, because again, going back and trying to recreate what the intent was from ATRT2, we said let's go with an absolute view of did they do with the recommendation said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, we might scoot to the almost end, if you can take a quick zoom through, Pat. Well, actually it's a good segue if we come back to this. Can we move beyond diversity on the board please? Not that I don't care about it. Just briefly on public consultations, one of the things we've observed is there's several different types of engagement with the community that are coming into favor lately. You know, it could be a blog, it could be a letter, it could be a white paper, it could be, I don't know a chain of phone calls.

There's all sorts of methods that people seem to think are engagement with the community and it's very confusing for the community to know what level of response reactivity and reaction they should expect from these. So, we will be looking at not just public comments but the public comment consultation process we did survey, but we will be looking at these other types of community engagement and seeing if we can get some depth and color, some clarification, some predictability for the community on what means what. Let's move on. We won't touch on PDPs at this stage, I think we'll skip that.

PAT KANE:

Cheryl, if I could, one thing under public consultations that we wanted to ask about which was what kind of kind of tools would be useful with these other types of engagements from either ICANN Board, ICANN Org,

et cetera. So, if we have a blog that's come out, what kind of commentary do we want to be able to provide back? It could be Survey Monkey, it could be more of a traditional type commentary, and so we'd like some input from this group to kind of get a feel for what would be meaningful in these additional public consultations that aren't traditional public comment periods.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks Pat, what we might do, time being our enemy here again, if you just keep scrolling until I say stop, keep scrolling. Okay, that will do for now, it's come back. We're planning on having our draft report about mid December with a public comment running through to the end of January, and we know that there is an awful lot of other parallel activities going on at that time and we will do our best to try and make sure that our interactions with you during this public consultation is clear, unambiguous, and allows for people to respond to particular questions or to the paper in general.

If you could roll back to Board Diversity. That's a segway, Tom, to our work, because much of what I would have said if we didn't have the tag team between the NomCom review implementation process and the work of ATRT, would have been saying, and a lot of this is being done by the nominating committee review implementation. It does fit in our bailiwick, but there are an awful lot of the diversity questions that is firmly in the area of the nominating committee, whether it should or should not be and how the pressures are put on or not put on any given nominating committee to fix the diversity issues, it's geographic diversity as per the bylaws, but there's also all the other diversities, not

the least of which are gender equality issues needing to be considered. And these are things that a lot of work is going to be looked at, worked with the community and eventually implemented in the work that Tom's doing, and Vanda, and several of us in the room. So, Tom, did you want to grab that and get your slide deck briefly done through?

TOM BARRETT:

Thank you, Cheryl. Can we switch the slides? Hi everyone, I'm Tom Barrett, Chair of the NomCom, working with Cheryl and Zahid on the nominating committee review and we're going to start right at Slide 9, just to give you a quick graphic in terms of where the review is today. We actually started our work about two years ago, developing the RFP for the independent evaluator, who, as you can see here was selected in March 2018, and they conducted a series of interviews and surveys and public outreach sessions and developed 27 recommendations for revising how the nominating committee works.

That report again went through a public comment period, was accepted by the Board in June 2018, and then the Board authorized the review working group to take a look at those 27 recommendations and determine the feasibility of implementing those 27 recommendations, which the working group did, made some revisions to make them perhaps more practical and achievable and again in December of 2018, submitted that report to the Board and again, it was approved without any changes by the Board in March 2019.

So, those are the first two phases of the review and the Board basically authorized the review working group to commence what we call the

Implementation Phase of the review. We split the implementation phase into two parts. The first part was a detailed implementation plan which looked at again the various different steps for each of the 27 recommendations in terms of what should take place for implementing those, where involvement was required from the community or ICANN Organization, what the budget implications would be for each of those recommendations.

And so we, as a working group, completed that first phase of implementation and submitted to the Board in September, just two months ago, the implementation planning document for doing the implementation of these 27 recommendations. And so, this week we expect a Board approval, they had some feedback to us in terms of some of those recommendation plans that we had put together and we do expect approval of that document this week and so in two weeks we will kick off the actual implementation of those 27 recommendations for the Nominating Committee.

If I can go back two slides. I just want to real quickly highlight who's been involved in this effort, specifically this implementation phase. So it's been very nice, we saw a surge of interest from the ALAC. It shows here 11 members formally joined the implementation working group that was started just about six months ago. And so we've had a lot of great contributions from ALAC members, but as you can see, it was a fairly well diversified group throughout the ICANN community.

So the next slide, the other thing I want to emphasize is that everything we're doing is fully transparent, it's publicly available on the ICANN wiki, every teleconference call we've had has been recorded and transcribed.

So you're welcome to take a look at the historical archive there, if you'd like to understand how we arrived at certain outcomes. And again, we are always open to new volunteers in this process, so we'll explain to you later how you can indicate your interest if you are interested. But most importantly, we recognize that unlike some of the stakeholder reviews, we don't have a single group that we need to implement these reviews for, but it's an ICANN wide community effort.

So we're trying to go above and beyond, in terms of community outreach and making sure that we have consensus on how to implement these recommendations that have been approved by the Board. So if we can proceed forward to Slide 14. So to give you an idea of the detailed implementation plan that was submitted to the Board back in September, again, there are 27 recommendations, for each of those recommendations, the working group estimated a timeline for implementing the recommendation. We have a definition of desired outcomes. We have an explanation of what issues that are trying to be addressed with that recommendation. A way to measure success of the implementation of the recommendation.

And finally, any budgetary implications for each of those 27 recommendations. And we also assessed the degree of difficulty to implement those. So just to give you an idea, we identified 11 as fairly easy to implement or fairly low cost, and that primarily involved things such as doing some training or implementing some procedures in terms of standard communications of the nominating committee. We have 11 that are normal standard implementation costs. And then finally, 5 that we deemed as having a significant budgetary impact, which of course

would need to be approved through the normal ICANN budget process.
Next slide please.

So, as part of what we're doing we also recognize that many of these, even though we've been working at this for nearly two years, some of the community will be hearing about some of these changes for the first time. And so we continue to identify additional opportunities to make sure that the impacted groups are aware of how these recommendations will impact the charter of their organization or the bylaws of their organization, as well as the overall, ICANN community itself.

So, we have already started to identify what you see here across the top are Recommendations 1 through 19, and we have a second slide for the rest, and we started to identify which ones we think require some special outreach, which ones impact the nominating committee operating procedures, which ones we want to go out for public comment for, which ones require an ICANN bylaws change. And finally, which ones have a budget impact. And so we've taken that first assessment and that's part of the detailed implementation plan that we provided to the ICANN Board back in September. So if we can jump ahead to Slide 18.

So, in terms of Next Steps, as the feedback from the OEC right now is favorable, so we do expect approval from the ICANN Board this week and then we plan to kick off the actual implementation of the 27 recommendations in about two weeks time frame. And as I said earlier, one of our first activities will be to initiate community outreach in a variety of different ways, so that the community can start thinking

about how this might impact their particular SO or AC and of course, during the face to face meetings at the ICANN meeting in March in Mexico, we will do additional outreach sessions and perhaps do some webinars before that.

And then as part of our charter or charge from the ICANN Board we will be providing six month written updates to the OEC Committee of the Board throughout 2020 and continuing into 2021 for any recommendations that we're continuing to implement. And so I don't think we need to go through all of these details, if you go to the next slide, but it's an example of we've identified for each recommendation where we think we need to do output or community output and feedback.

As I said, nearly all is about 19 of the 27 recommendations that we believe specific outreach will be desirable in terms of making sure the community understands what their role is and their obligation is, as part of this implementation. Again, if you're interested in joining the committee, scroll back, I'm sorry, go back to that Slide 18. The email to contact is mssi-secretariat@icann.org. So, if you think you're interested in helping us implement these, we would certainly welcome that. And I think I'll pause there and see if there are any questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. We've got the queue starting with Eduardo and please, I won't put a one minute timer on you yet.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, this is Eduardo for the record. These reviews are going to be implemented with the next NomCom that is happening now?

TOM BARRETT: We're trying to avoid impacting the current NomCom. Because as you know, they're having their kickoff meeting this week and so we do not want to try to disrupt the current NomCom cycle. And so we certainly are coordinating closely with the NomCom, in a way they are an incubator for some of these recommendations and willing to perhaps experiment, but by no means is it our intent that any of these recommendations become operational with this current NomCom cycle.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anyone else wish to ask any questions, any clarifications? In which case, I guess it falls to me to thank us all. Thank us, team, it's been a pleasure working with you. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for giving your input. We're getting more out of this than I suspect you did because you're giving us a great deal of useful information. But I know Tom and I are more than open to any, "oh, I wish I would have said that," -- just email us, we will be doing a lot more outreach and engagement with a number of these issues, won't we, Tom? We'll be back. Thank you very much, I believe we're pretty much on time. Back to you, Madam Chair.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]