

---

ICANN72 | Prep Week – ICANN Reviews and Implementation Status Update  
Tuesday, October 12, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 PDT

PAMELA SMITH: Welcome to the ICANN Reviews and Implementation Update Session. Ivette Yvette Guigneaux and I are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that the session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the chat pod. I will read them aloud during the time set by the chair of this session, which will be at the end of the presentation. Please review the notes for how to frame a question properly. I've been posting this information in the chat pod, then will post it once again. All participants in the session may make comments in the chat.

Please note that private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom Webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session hosts, co-hosts, and other panelists.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Theresa Swinehart.

THERESA SWINEHART: Hi, everybody. And welcome to this webinar and to the ICANN72 kickoff with the virtual sessions here. I'd like to welcome you and give just a

---

***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.***

---

quick overview of some of the different things that we'll be covering, and then hand it over to my colleagues.

As you can see, we're covering several topics relating to ICANN's Review program and the implementation of the community recommendations themselves.

As the current cycle of specific and organizational reviews is concluding, the focus is really on the implementation of recommendations and also applying our collective lessons learned to improve reviews in the next cycle. Reviews, as you know, are how we integrate continuous improvements into our work to help the multistakeholder model evolve.

Before the next cycle of reviews begins, we're going to be exploring, with your help, how to achieve more impactful review outcomes—more concise recommendations—that have a clear path to implementation so that when the implementation is complete, we can all agree that something significant has been improved because of the work. That is, the intention of the recommendations has been achieved and we can see how that is impacting things and what the results are of that and to allow some time for that.

As you know, we have a sizable inventory of community recommendations to implement at this time, and you'll be hearing about the progress in this area. For example, specific review teams issued 125 recommendations; CCWG accountability Work Stream 216 recommendations. And some of these recommendations are complex and have dependencies on other work. So as we're looking at

---

implementing the recommendations and making sure that's done very well, making sure that we have looked, also, at the dependencies of the different recommendations to make sure that, holistically, we are applying these very well and with the intention of those.

I'll give you an example. The Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Reviews (CCT) and the Security, Stability & Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR) both issued a significant number of recommendations that addressed DNS abuse and threat mitigation. So that's an example of where it's important to consider all of these recommendations in a comprehensive way in order to fully understand how to approach the implementation in a way that respects the multistakeholder process, the intention of the recommendations, the hard work of the community, and the extensive work already underway around these areas in order to be making meaningful improvements around that.

So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Xavier, my colleague, to talk a little bit about some of the areas of work. Xavier, over to you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Theresa. Welcome, everyone, to Prep Week for ICANN72. Can I have the next slide, please? Next slide. Thank you.

So Theresa was just indicating that a lot of the specific reviews work is now at the stage of its implementation after Board decisions have been made to adopt recommendations. And in order to support well this work and to provide focus on this implementation work, the

---

organization created last year a new department within the teams that focuses on implementation work.

So there are, effectively, two teams that together, hand in hand, support the overall review process. The Reviews Support and Accountability Team is the team that supports the review process while the review is occurring and all the way to the Board decision.

And from that Board decision on, the Implementation Operations Team is the one that then takes over the responsibility of implementing the Board-adopted recommendations that have been submitted by the Review Team.

And those two teams, of course, work together throughout the process of review, but the creation of the Implementation Operations Team was helping to provide focus on the implementation work which is focused from both a skillset standpoint, but also from a purpose standpoint. This team has the purpose to very straightforwardly, very simply implement the Board-approved, Board-adopted review recommendations and ensure that these recommendations translate into sustainable and effective activities or projects within the organization that produce the desired outcomes from the recommendations that were submitted. Can I have the next slide, please?

So taking advantage of this week at ICANN72, we want to provide a little bit of an update on the reviews. And we're going to go over a few slides that provide that update. Next slide, please.

---

First, to remind everyone on the specific review process and provide a little bit of clarity on what that process looks like. And we'll see more of that in terms of status in the next few slides. Here is a very simple diagram that provides a little bit better understanding of the various stages of specific review which starts on the top right with, obviously, the community-led review, the work of the community, that produces final recommendations submitted to the Board.

The next stage, further down on the right, is the Board review and adoption by the Board of the recommendations after considering the ones that have been submitted by the Review Team in their final report.

And after the Board recommendations, starts the implementation work. This implementation work is really broken out into several phase, all pertaining—if you think about it from that perspective—to the work of implementation, but in a specific order.

So first, because there are so many community recommendations adopted by the Board that require implementation, prioritization is needed. What are we going to do first and what is dependent on other work? All that consideration needs to happen. And I'll come back to that topic a little bit later.

Once the work of implementation for any given review, or recommendations of reviews, has been prioritized, then the implementation needs to be designed. How are we going to carry out the activity or projects that achieve the purpose that each recommendation had? What are we going to do? Who's going to

---

do it? When is it going to happen? In which sequence is it going to happen? So all of that this being designed in that second phase of implementation.

Once the design has occurred, the planning of that work needs to happen. Now that we know what we are going to do, then we plan for when we are going to do it and who's going to do it. And that's the planning cycle in light blue here.

And finally, the actual implementation work can be carried out and be concluded with a report on that implementation work on what has been put in place. And of course, on further measuring the effects of the implementation work in terms of desired outcomes which should obviously match the objectives and desired outcomes that the Review Team designed at the time the review recommendations were submitted.

And that closes the cycle until the next review of the same nature appears to review further the history of what happened with this recommendation.

Just a quick indication as well here that, while we are talking about reviews here, some cross-community work has followed or is following a very similar type of processes. Next slide, please.

So to give you a quick overview of status but also following this cycle that we just looked at, here is, at a glance, the four CCT reviews as well

---

as for three cross-community works that are ongoing. At the bottom of the slide, you will see an overview of status.

So first you can see that each of these lines which represent a review or a cross-community work have the same pattern of, and the same sequence of steps which we just looked at: the review, the Board action, the prioritization, design, planning, and implementation—from left to right. Every one of them has, technically, that set of steps.

In blue you have what has already been completed. In purple you have what is currently being worked on. In gray, you have the next steps that are not yet being worked on.

You can see that, for some reviews—take at the top the CCT Review which Theresa mentioned a little bit earlier—there are several of the phase that are currently being worked on. Why? Because within the set of recommendations of a given review, there could be recommendations at different stages of progress. Some are in design, some are being planned for, some are being implemented.

And some of you may know that, also, for some of those reviews, a few recommendations may have already been implemented and that implementation be completed. So when you see several purple boxes on this slide, it means that there are recommendations at various stages of those various phases of work.

ATRT3 is another example. The work of implementation will need to be prioritized, and there is some implementation design that is also already in progress. Why? Because there's been one recommendation

---

of ATRT3 that has already been prioritized through the Board decision. And that is Recommendation 5 which suggests that the review implementation work should be prioritized.

So that recommendation is about prioritization, and therefore it's being worked on. [Admittedly], there was actually work going on already in the organization to organize a process of prioritization, community based, which then allows to determine the order of priority of the implementation work.

And that Prioritization Framework that is currently being developed is going to address this phase of prioritization, the third phase from the left, that you have for each review.

The CCWGs. And you probably recognize several of them. The WS2, if I take this as an example, is a priority for the FY22 fiscal year for the organization. It was established as a priority and submitted as such for the FY22 planning year and has been worked on. You can see here that it was prioritized, as I indicated, in our FY22 plan. The implementation design is completed, and now it's being scheduled for work. And some of the work is already in implementation, as you probably all know.

This is also partially true for the community work pertaining to WS2. As you know, many of the recommendations are for the community organizations to implement. And some communities have already started the work. Others are considering that work. And this is where there is community work in the implementation design at the moment as well. Next slide, please.



---

So there is a very important look into the future that, of course, everyone will want to do. Theresa indicated earlier that the specific review cycle has come to an end with the end of the ATRT3 and the end of SSR2. And therefore, what is the next cycle of reviews going to look like?

So affecting that future, the ATRT3 recommendations to reform the specific and organizational reviews is obviously going to be first taken into account. It redesigns the organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. And there's a new cadence of reviews that is resulting from the ATRT3 recommendations or reviews as well that needs, of course, to be taken into account.

ATRT3 has produced recommendations relative to evolving reviews reflecting a certain amount of lessons learned from the review process. And there is more work that has been produced around lessons learned on reviews. What do we want to improve? What do we want to change? These reviews are fundamentally important. They take on a focus and resources from the community and from the organization. And it's a natural and necessary process to ensure that we continuously improve the process of those reviews.

So based on those needs, there is a need to redesign reviews triggered by the ATRT3 recommendations to improve their effectiveness and outcome, to design and implement a continuous improvement process, and to also ensure the continuous evolution of our multistakeholder model which obviously relies very critically on those reviews.

---

As a result, the timing of the next cycle of reviews which is, as many of you know, embedded in our bylaws will need to be amended to reflect the next “generation” of review process that will result from the ATRT3 recommendations that need to be implemented.

That work will need to be prioritized and planned for. It will be demanding on all of us as an ecosystem. The involvement of the community and the engagement of the community needs to be embedded into the schedules of work for everyone. This will be a relatively significant amount of work. It will take a lot of engagement, a lot of discussions; and then be able to pilot, to test, to start the implementation and then carry it out. So this is a significant amount of work that is ahead of all of us.

Of course, changing the bylaws will be required, as well, to reflect the new version of reviews and continuous improvement into the bylaws. That’s also part of the work ahead of us.

And just for clarity, we will address questions towards the end of the presentation. And I see there are a number of questions in the chat which we will come back to. With that, let me move to the next slide.

So as I was indicating earlier, while there is currently ... As there would be, thanks to the bylaws-defined schedule of reviews ... And many of you have participated to incorporate this cycle of reviews into the bylaws to make sure that it continue “forever.” But because we have that established expectation from the bylaws of a cycle of reviews which we know will be effected in a manner that is yet to be determined

---

from the implementation of the ATRT3 recommendations on reviews, then we don't know what the cycle will look like.

So there's been a postponement already of, for example, the GNSO3 organizational reviews which you see at the top left here of this slide. And the rest of the reviews will need to be re-evaluated in terms of their cycles to synchronize the timing with the future cycle of reviews that will be determined after the implementation of ATRT3 recommendations.

With that, let me go to the next slide, please. And I will pass it on to Larisa, I believe, for the next slide on organizational reviews.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much, Xavier. Hello, everybody. I'm Larisa Gurnick, and my team is Review Support & Accountability. And you heard about what our focus areas are earlier from Xavier. I'm here to speak to you today about the organizational reviews. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So a little bit about organizational reviews. They are an important part of ICANN's accountability and are critical to maintaining a healthy multistakeholder model. Organizational reviews focus on assessing the effectiveness of supporting organizations and advisory committees in meeting the needs of the global stakeholder community. These reviews are required by the bylaws and take place on a five-year cycle based on feasibility.

Organizational reviews are conducted by independent examiners as opposed to specific reviews which are community-led reviews. And

---

independent examiners look at and assess whether the organization has a continuing purpose, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve how effectively it operates, and whether the organization is accountable to its constituencies and stakeholders.

The reviews of different organizations are currently in various phases, with most moving toward completion in the second round of reviews. This is an important milestone in itself because it demonstrates accountability.

Independent reviews lead to recommendations that are implemented in order to improve how the organizations function and serve their stakeholders. Implementation work is still in progress in two areas, as you can see. The RSSAC is finalizing the implementation of several of the recommendations that came out of that review. And the community group that is working on the implementation of NomCom Review recommendations is similarly continuing its work and looking to wrap up their extensive efforts in short order.

In the spirit of continuous improvement, we note lessons learned from each review, and together with community input, we'll use these learnings to inform the next cycle and improve outcomes, as you heard, from Theresa and Xavier.

So how will the future organizational reviews be different? A little bit more about that. The Board-approved recommendations from the third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) will impact how

---

organizational reviews will be conducted in the future. Several aspects will be significant.

ATRT3 envisioned that organizational reviews would evolve into a continuous improvement program with regular self-evaluations and ongoing improvements and periodic independent reviews at the discretion of each organization.

ATRT3 also created a new community review, a Holistic Review. The objectives of this review are: to review the continuous improvement efforts of all organizations; to assess the effectiveness of collaboration mechanisms between the organizations; to review the accountability of SOs and ACs to their stakeholders; and finally, to determine if the SOs and ACs continue to have a purpose within ICANN as a whole.

As you can see, there are connections and independencies between the Continuous Improvement Program and the Holistic Review which will need to be addressed during the process of designing the pilots and the reviews. This work has not yet begun yet, as you heard from Xavier and the chart that showed status of the different components.

This third review of the GNSO that was scheduled to begin in June of 2021 based on the current bylaws was deferred by the Board. And additionally, the Board directed ICANN Org to work with the community to develop a comprehensive plan for the next cycle of organizational reviews in light of the ATRT3 recommendations that will likely impact the future scope of organizational reviews. And this work is currently underway.

---

As the current cycle of review wraps up, ICANN Org will continue to support community implementation work and the ongoing tracking and monitoring of ongoing activities important to the overall accountability and transparency of all organizations. You can find the current status of each organizational review on the ICANN Org pages. And we have some links at the end of the presentation that will help you do that, as well as on the various community Wiki spaces that are dedicated or organizational reviews.

And at this point, I will invite my colleague Alice Jansen to provide an update on specific reviews. Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you very much, Larisa. Hi, everyone. This is Alice Jansen from the Implementation Operations Function.

So moving on to the specific reviews-related updates. We will first start with the CCT. The CCT is the Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review, [and it] primarily serves to examine the extent to which the introduction of new gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the Domain Name System.

The final report contains 35 recommendations. Six recommendations were accepted by the Board in 2019, and the Board subsequently took action in 2020 to approve 11 of the recommendations that were initially placed in pending status. This now brings us to a total of 17 recommendations that are approved.

---

A dedicated cross-functional team of ICANN Org subject matter experts is working on designing and planning for an effective implementation of these recommendations. And implementation in some instances has already started.

Three recommendations are considered fully implemented, and three partially implemented. And we do want to note, as well, that in some instances, there are dependencies on the outcome of the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group as well as on the continuation and restitution of DNS abuse-related [community] discussions which the Cross-Functional Project Team is careful to factor into its design.

There are currently six recommendations in pending status, two of which are tied to ongoing [community] discussions we're now monitoring, as well as four remaining recommendations that do not have dependencies and that ICANN Org is continuing to work on. ICANN Org is continuing to work on these until we're ready for Board action and consideration.

Fourteen recommendations were passed through to community groups, in whole or in part, for consideration. And ICANN Org continues to welcome any updates from the community on these.

You can find the status of the CCT-approved recommendations on ICANN Org's website, and my colleague Yvette will post a link the chat for you as well so you have it for your convenience. If we can move to the next slide.

---

So now we are talking about the RDS-WHOIS2 which is the second iteration of the Registration Directory Service Review. This review effort primarily served to assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD Registration Directory Service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promotes consumer trust, and safeguards registrant data.

Implementation designs and progress. Of the 15 recommendations the Board approved, in whole or in part, in February 2020, 3 are considered complete and 3 partially complete. Implementation of two was put on hold, and this [inaudible] to Board approval of ATRT3 recommendation to suspend any further RDS Review pending the outcome of the next ATRT.

This ATRT is a specific review effort that my colleague Negar will provide an update on in a moment.

Similar to the CCT, there's a Cross-Functional Project Team of subject matter experts working on designing and planning for implementation. A number of the approved recommendations do have dependencies on ongoing [committee] work, notably on the outcome of Phase 2 of the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data which the Cross-Functional is mindful of, of course.

One of the 15 recommendations is actually being addressed through implementation of the EPDP Phase 1. We currently have a total of four recommendations in pending status. And given the EPDP Phase 2 dependencies here, the Board will consider these in light of an impact



---

analysis to be completed at the Board action on EPDP Phase 2 as appropriate and applicable.

Two recommendations were passed through, in whole or in part, to the GNSO for consideration, and a response was provided to the Board on these.

Again, you can find the status of these RDS-WHOIS2-approved recommendations on ICANN Org’s website. And, Yvette, if you could pop the link in the chat for everyone to see, that would be great. Thank you so much.

With that, I will now give the mic to my colleague, Negar, who will speak about ATRT3.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Alice. Hello, everyone. My name is Negar Farzinnia. I’m a member of the Implementation Operations Team at ICANN Org, and I will be providing you with an update on the status of the third Accountability and Transparency Review as well as the second Security, Stability & Resiliency of the Domain Name System Review.

So starting with ATRT3, if you recall the [inaudible] on the ATRT3 final report on November 30<sup>th</sup> of [inaudible] and proceeded to approve five recommendations consisting of 15 component parts, as issued in the final report and specified in the score card that accompanied the Board resolution language.

---

The Board approved four of these recommendations, subject to prioritization, and noted that the implementation of ATRT3 Recommendation 5 that calls for the prioritization of community recommendations should proceed.

As Xavier noted earlier, there was a problem that had started already to address prioritization need within ICANN Org, and the Board acknowledged that the implementation of Recommendation 5 of ATRT3 is dependent upon the need to prioritize all of ICANN's work through the annual planning cycle and also the need for the development of a framework in collaboration with the community and ICANN Org.

During FY21, ICANN Org launched the Planning Prioritization Framework project with the intent to run a pilot focusing on the prioritization of recommendations resulting from specific reviews. And while the Planning Prioritization Framework is comprehensive and includes all activities and large projects of ICANN, a subset of this framework will contribute to the design implementation phase of the Board-approved Recommendation 5 of ATRT3 on prioritization of community recommendations.

Please note that there is a separate session that's organized by ICANN Org's planning team. This is taking place on Wednesday the 13<sup>th</sup> of October. At the end of this presentation, we do have links included for various related sessions, one of which is this planning session. I encourage you to participate in the session if time allows to learn more about where that process is at.

---

As Xavier noted, the remaining four recommendations of ATRT3 are awaiting prioritization before we can move it to the planning, design, and implementation phase. Next slide, please. Thank you.

The second Security, Stability & Resiliency Review Team submitted its final report to the ICANN Board on the 25<sup>th</sup> of January of this year. The report contained 63 recommendations, on which the Board took action on 22<sup>nd</sup> of July of 2021. In its consideration of the SSR2 final recommendations, the Board ended up developing six categories of action which moved some of the recommendations to final action now while allowing sufficient additional time for further analysis and consideration of the relevant significant factors that impact the feasibility of implementing other recommendations.

In total, the Board approved 13 recommendations subject to prioritization, risk assessment and mitigation, costing and implementation considerations; and noted that, of these 13 recommendations, 2 are considered fully implemented.

For these recommendations that are considered fully implemented, ICANN Org will prepare reports of how these recommendations were implemented, which is the report which will be assessed by the next SSR Review cycle.

The remaining approved recommendations are awaiting prioritization and implementation design.

The Board also proceeded to place a total of 35 recommendations into three different pending categories. Four of the 34 recommendations

---

were placed into “pending, likely to be approved once further information is gathered to enable approval.”

A total of six recommendations were [placed into pending], but likely to be rejected unless additional information shows implementation is feasible.”

And 24 recommendations were placed into “pending, holding to seek further clarity and information” on these recommendations.

At this point, the Board was unable to signal whether it was likely to accept or reject these recommendations until further information was provided to them.

For these pending recommendations, ICANN Org is tasked to resolve the actions that have been identified by the Board in the score card accompanying the Board resolution, and has initiated the process to document the questions that need addressing for the Board to be able to make a final decision.

ICANN Org will engage with the SSR2 Implementation shepherds, of course, and other community representatives as appropriate to seek input on these questions. The outcome of these engagements will then be taken into account by ICANN Org in its analysis to prepare the Board to take further action on these pending recommendations.

Lastly, the Board rejected a total of 16 recommendations. Of these 16, 6 recommendations were rejected because the Board could not approve them in full. While portions of these recommendations could be feasible—and in some cases, Org is actually already underway to

---

deal with the underlying issues on portions of these recommendations—limitations imposed by other portions of the same recommendation could impact feasibility in light of the bylaws and the Board and ICANN Org remit.

Under the current ICANN bylaws, the Board does not have the option to selectively approve or reject parts of a single, individual, indivisible community recommendation. And so they must act on a recommendation as a whole, as written, and not really as interpreted by ICANN Org or the Board.

The remaining 10 recommendations the Board rejected have detailed rationale which sets out the specific reasons for the Board's decision in the rationale document accompanying the Board resolution documentation. Next slide, please. Thank you very much.

Now we're moving on to the next section of our presentation. As Xavier noted earlier in the presentation, in addition to the implementation of specific reviews that you've just heard about, there are other non policy-related recommendations resulting from the work of the cross-community working groups and some special projects that the ICANN Org Implementation Operations Team works on implementing.

And at the stage, we will be providing you with updates on two such projects today. One, the evolution of ICANN's multistakeholder model; and two, the status of the Work Stream 2 implementation. Next slide, please. Thank you.

---

The evolution of the multistakeholder model program, as you may recall, originated in 2019 with the objective to focus on evolving ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance. This community-wide effort identified six overarching issues which are hindering the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. Further, the community ended up prioritizing three of these six issues for a more immediate-term implementation.

That is not removing the need for implementation of the other three topics. It's just that we are, due to bandwidth limitations and mindful of everyone's workload, focusing on three issues that are prioritized first, followed with the remaining topics.

The prioritized issue are as follows: prioritization of the work and efficient use of resources, precision in scoping of work, consensus representation, and inclusivity.

Now, to better determine how each of these issues could be addressed, there were a lot of discussions that took place with the community which identified a number of activities and projects that are currently underway within the community, Org, and the Board that could address these issues.

Further discussions also identified some gap areas that need to yet be addressed to cohesively [inaudible] that have been identified. [inaudible] projects have already been implemented or are currently in the process of being implemented. And ICANN Org is evaluating the gaps that have been identified, the amount of work involved to get

---

those new projects or gap areas implemented, as well as monitoring the progress on work areas that are already in progress and underway.

Well, what happens when all of these projects and work areas have been implemented? Well, in the course of their discussions, the Board, ICANN Org, and the community agreed that it would be beneficial to be able to evaluate some of the projects and work tracks that we are undertaking to assess how they impact the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model.

And to that end, ICANN Org started designing a proposed evaluation methodology to really help the ICANN ecosystem as a whole be able to evaluate how that multistakeholder model has evolved. As this work progresses, ICANN Org will be engaging with the community to further discuss the proposed evaluation methodology and its use and application.

Enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model is a very complex program and requires resources from the Org, the Board, and the community to carry out the planning for implementation and subsequent implementation efforts.

ICANN Org, of course, understands the criticality of this effort as well as the complexities that are involved in implementing these various work areas identified and prioritized, and will continue to work with the Board and the community to carry out the activities needed to achieve the intended objectives.

---

With that, I'll pass it over to my colleague Alice to provide an update on the status of the Work Stream 2 project.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you very much, Negar. So we're now going to zoom in on the Work Stream 2 implementation project, which is an ICANN Org priority in this FY22, as Xavier indicated earlier in this presentation.

Let me provide you with some background first. At the conclusion of the IANA Stewardship Transition in 2016, the cross-community effort on enhancing ICANN accountability—better known as CCWG-Accountability—proceeded to launch a second work stream focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation could extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

This cross-community effort concluded with the publication of a final report that contained 100 consensus-based recommendations on a range of topics which the Board adopted in November 2019. Implementation has started for a large portion of these recommendations. In some instances, implementation of some recommendations is also complete.

And as announced earlier this year, ICANN Org convened an internal Cross-Functional Project Team to complete the implementation design. And this effort, we're pleased to announce, is now concluded.

In addition to defining a roadmap, this exercise also helped shed light on what work may proceed now as opposed to tasks and



---

recommendations that are interwoven or dependent on other initiatives.

The CCWG-Accountability addressed a number of these recommendations to the community, and ICANN Org is supporting the community groups in their planning for implementation work as appropriate.

Now that implementation design is complete, we expect much progress on this particular issue in the coming months and we'll be reporting back to the community in more detail on this.

In the meantime, there is a dedicated implementation status page on the community Wiki which you can refer to for more information. The page currently contains the recommendations by recommendation status and will be supplemented in the next few days, or shortly, with more information on the work that will be conducted to address this important set of recommendations.

With that, I will now give it back to Pamela to introduce the related information and sessions of interests. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH:

Thank you, Alice. Yvette, can I go to the next slide, please? These are related information. Thank you to all our presenters. Please note the resource links to all of the reviews Wikis which are available in slide deck which is posted on the schedule session link to ICANN72 Prep Week. May I have the next slide?

---

We'd also like to bring your attention to another of our Prep Week sessions which may be of interest to you, which is the session tomorrow, the 13<sup>th</sup> of October 2021 at 16:00 UTC. Can we back up one slide, please, Yvette? Thank you. The Planning and Prioritization Framework Design Update.

And with that, I'm going to address the comments and questions that we have taken. And we thank you for your participation. Hold on just a second. Let me read those.

Okay. So Cheryl Langdon Orr made the comment that, "At least in the case of ATRT3, a set of proposed priority ranks was also given for the five recommendations made."

We had a question from Paul McGrady for Xavier. "Here is a high-level and earnest question, and I'm sorry if I've missed the Q&A tab. How did you get stuck with this? It doesn't seem to fall natural within the remit of a CFO? Yes, reviews cost money, but everything does. So that can't be the reason. Thanks for anything you can tell us about how the reviews are being assigned within the organization. Clarity will help us know who to go to within ICANN Org with questions, concerns, offers of help, etc. Thanks, Xavier."

Xavier, do you care to address that?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Yes. Thank you, Pamela. And thank you, Paul, for the question. A very natural question.

---

So there was an announcement published last year around the first of July to explain the rationale for your question, but I'll address it very quickly. So you're right. Implementation of review recommendations is not obviously or very clearly in the scope of financial responsibility.

So technically speaking, I'm also responsible for planning the entire organization's work in the community process based on that work as well. So when you look from a planning standpoint, there is a very strong planning component associated with the review and implementation work. If you think about it that way, a lot of planning is required for that implementation work. And that's why, by extension to that planning "hat" that I wear in the organization, the responsibility for implementation work of a review recommendation was added to my responsibilities.

So that's the connection with my role. It is different, for sure, as you indicated from financial responsibilities. But it more pertains to planning. And while it's not just planning work to implement, it takes a lot of planning efforts which are well-connected with my planning responsibilities. So I hope that helps address your question.

Relative to who you need to talk to, we wanted the fact that we have two different teams to be very seamless from a community standpoint, from an external standpoint. You can ask any review question to anyone in the two teams led Larisa and led by me at the moment. Anyone in these two teams will be able to direct you to the right person if they are not the right person to answer the questions. So you should

---

feel very comfortable that anyone in these two teams can be addressing any questions or concerns.

Practically speaking, the way we allocate the work between the two of us—and that’s why I indicated earlier on the slide—up to the Board decision, Larisa’s team supports the review team. That’s the Reviews Support and Accountability Team. And from the Board decision on, the Implementation Operations Team takes over.

Both teams are very involved in both phases. So while the review team is supported by Larisa, my team is also participating to that support. Maybe a little bit more in the background, but to make sure, we’re fully aware of the review work of the recommendations themselves so that when the time comes to pick up the work of implementation, we are all ready to go [inaudible].

So we back up each other, if you see what I’m saying. We work together hand in hand. And again, from a community standpoint, this should be very [synchronous]. Thank you very much, Paul, for the question.

PAMELA SMITH:

Thank you, Xavier. Steve DelBianco made two comment in the chat. The first was, “Given that the bylaw allow ATRT to adjust specific reviews, so we still require bylaws amendment?” And the second was, “The organizational reviews have been in the bylaw for decades and were not affected by IANA Transition bylaws changes.”

Sam Eisner, I believe you were going to address those.

SAM EISNER:

Thanks. So on the second one, I did place a note into the chat. Steve is correct that the organizational reviews were pretty much unaffected. We did add in a new facet for the organizational reviews to consider around the accountability of the entity under review to its constituent entities as part of the Transition work.

But I did want to address the first question that Steve had about the interplay of the bylaws and the ATRT3 and whether, because the ATRT3 recommended a change to the cadence, the bylaws need to change.

So, Steve, we think that, with the ATRT3 recommendations, we're comfortable having a basis for not changing the bylaws today in order to identify that there will be an impact to the current cadence that we would expect. So we know that there will be reviews deferred and that there will be a change, for example, to the CCT and that it's only supposed to run more time, etc.

So we know that we have a sufficient basis to run the reviews that we would anticipate happening in the future on that basis. But we do think it's important after we see how the full cadence works out to then have that re-embodied in the bylaws. So if we're only intending to run an RDS Review on a particular schedule, that schedule should be updated in the bylaws so people won't have to go back through and go back in history to see where that change happened without it being reflected in the bylaws.

---

We think, in the end, it’s important to have these things really properly documented so everyone knows where it stands. But the bylaws changes themselves would be something that we’re not ready to schedule in the future because we want to make sure that we understand the full package before we go through another bylaws revision on this.

PAMELA SMITH:

Thank you, Sam. Donna Austin made a comment. “This presentation would be enhanced by a timeline with dates so we can have the better appreciation of the time taken to complete various stages of each of the respective reviews and CCWG efforts.”

Larisa Gurnick answered this question in the chat. “In response to your comment”—and I’ve already read that into the record—“thank you for the comment. The details of dates and timelines are currently available on individual icann.org pages dedicated to each review. We will look for ways we can integrate this information into our future presentations on reviews.”

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Pamela, can I add to that answer, please?

PAMELA SMITH:

Absolutely, sir.

---

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. And thank you, Donna, for the question. And we fully agree with you that a timeline will be helpful to add in. And of course, at the comment sense a lot of the work has not been scheduled because it's not yet be prioritized, no timeline is available until we have that prioritization available.

What I mean by that is that for now, we have a number of recommendations, exceeding about 250, that require implementation. As I indicated earlier, we have decided last year to prioritize [inaudible] as work that needs to be implemented in a timely fashion. And I know you were wondering about that in another call we had last week. So that's been prioritized.

On that work, as I indicated as an example, the implementation design work is completed and the implementation work is scheduled over the rest of FY22. But the work has not yet been prioritized. But then, of course, there's no timeline available because the work has not been scheduled as of yet, as per the sequence of steps that we've indicated.

And it's a very important point that your question raises—or your suggestion is raising—because, of course everyone wants to know when things are going to happen. And it is very important to understand that since we're all working together, it's together that we are going to determine the timelines by which we want to do the work.

And of course, first we need to decide what we want to do before deciding when we can do it. Because at the moment, we don't know. We, Org, could decide what the priorities are, but that would be ignoring entirely the community's input, preference, desires on

---

prioritizing certain specific work over other work that is currently on the plate for implementation.

So that’s also a reason why there is not currently available, in a number of different recommendation work—for example [in CCWGs]—timelines associated with that. I just wanted to remind you of that. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH:

Thank you, Xavier. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben had a question. “Xavier, will you provide more details on the Holistic Review at the prioritization session later this week?”

Xavier responded in the chat. “Not specifically. The session on prioritization framework will provide an overview of the design work on this privation process/tool, but not specifically on this specific recommendation (the Holistic Review). As indicated just now by Negar, work on the Holistic Review has not started yet, as it has not been prioritized.”

Steve DelBianco had a question. “If EPDP Phase 2A recommendations are approved, how would that change the RDS pending recommendations?”

Alice Jansen answered. “Hi, Steve. To you question on the RDS-WHOIS2 pending recommendations, for Board action on final report of RDS-WHOIS2, ICANN Org will need to conduct an impact analysis to inform Board action as appropriate on the four pending recommendations. The impact analysis will need to be completed after Board action on



---

EPDP Phase 2, as appropriate and applicable. The EPDP Phase 2A recommendations, if approved, would be factored into this.”

The next comment was from Steve DelBianco. “Under post-Transition bylaws, the Empowered Community can challenge the Board decision to reject a review recommendation.”

Did anyone want to address that particular comment? Sam? Okay, then I’ll move on.

J-P Voilleque, “Are the two Board-approved pilot programs of ATRT3 on hold subject to prioritization? Could there not be a parallel process at least in terms of implementation design?”

XAVIER CALVEZ: I’m happy to address that, if you would like, Pamela.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Xavier. Please proceed.

XAVIER CALVEZ: So technically, yes, the two pilots that are embedded in the ATRT3 recommendations are subject to prioritization. The one topic relative within the ATRT, Recommendation 5 that I mentioned earlier, that recommendation contains specific recommendation to organize the prioritization of the implementation work. That’s what the ATRT Review Team decided was needed as we all said and discussed before because of the amount of implementation work that exists. And

---

therefore, the ATRT3 team suggested that there is a prioritization exercise that happens.

So that specific recommendation has been prioritized through the Board decision because it would be counterintuitive and unhelpful to delay this recommendation that this about prioritization so that it can be prioritized later.

So that recommendation and that pilot is the subject of the Prioritization Framework exercised. And, again, there will be a session later this week on that topic. That work had been initiated by the organization before the submission of the ATRT3 recommendation on prioritization. But of course, with the knowledge of that recommendation coming through which is completely consistent with the work that the Org had already initiated and that is currently going on.

So I certainly encourage anyone interested in that aspect of prioritization of the review implementation work to participate to the session on the prioritization framework that will be offered later this week. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH:

Okay. And then we have a couple of things we're going to read into the record quickly. Steve DelBianco. "If EPDP ..." I'm sorry, excuse me. We had a little jump there.

---

Sivasubramanian M. “To everyone, is ICANN Org bound to implement recommendations as written without room to interpret or improve upon the recommendations or basic nuances?”

And we are at the top of the hour, so given scheduling we do need to call a close to this. But additional questions will be addressed. Thank you. We will capture them from the chat and we will address them.

Thank you so much, everyone, for your attendance. We thank you for joining us. And please, enjoy ICANN72 Prep Week and ICANN72 to follow. Good night, good morning, good afternoon, whichever suits, and have a great day. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, everyone.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thanks, everybody.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, everyone.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Bye.

PAMELA SMITH: Bye.

---

LARISA GURNICK:                   Bye-bye.

STEVE DELBIANCO:               Yeah, good job.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**