
ICANN79 | CF – Reviews Program Session with the Community on ATRT4 Deferral and Pilot Holistic Review
Tuesday, March 5, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 SJU

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello and welcome to the Reviews Program Session with the Community on ATRT4 Deferral and Pilot Holistic Review on Tuesday, March 5, at 13:00 UTC.

My name is Yvette Guigneaux and Jessica Puccio and I will be your participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom and when called upon virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use the physical microphone to speak.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, and Portuguese. Please state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking if speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Theresa Swinehart, senior vice president of Global Domains and Strategy. Theresa?

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.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, everybody. It's great to be here. I look forward to the conversation around two areas that are going to be relevant in the context of the specific reviews.

How many are new to this conversation around reviews? No? Okay, then I won't repeat the part that they're actually a really important part of our governance structure more generally as an organization. So from that standpoint while we may have lower attendance in the room, the recording of this and everything else and the input that we're getting from the community is fundamentally important.

The evolution of the governance of the organization and specific reviews are a core category since the inception of ICANN and have been part of the process along the way both in the bylaws and then also in our transitional role with the U.S. administration. So I think sometimes it's important to remember that they're actually anchored in a longstanding history for the organization.

I know that today's session is going to talk about two specific areas from the specific reviews. One is the progress that's been made around the Pilot Holistic Review and the draft Terms of Reference that have gone through two public comment proceedings and multiple Board discussions and we're now at the next stage to prepare to initiate the work around this area. So look forward to hearing the update on this and the next steps around the progress of this.

The second area that's going to be talked about today too is the ATRT4. So this is the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review and this

timing of this. It's not a matter of whether one does it or not, but it's actually a matter of the timing in light of several other initiatives that are occurring that dovetail into this area of work and may have overlaps and as a result may also really have an impact on the bandwidth of the community in order to be able to focus in on it in a way that the community may want to. So looking at the timing of that I think is very, very important. It had come up in some side conversations as well. I had sent a letter to the SO and AC chairs and look forward to the input around that to help inform the Board discussion on that area.

So with that, I'm actually going to turn it back over to Larisa to run the session and the input and look forward to hearing how everything goes. And I'll need to scoot out to the other sessions that are running parallel. And we're sorry that there are so many sessions running parallel, but maybe it shows how much good work is going on right now.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Theresa. Hello, everybody. As Theresa said, there are many competing sessions, many competing priorities, so we're really appreciative of those of you, the group that's here, and we appreciate very much the time and attention. So let's go to the next slide please.

We'll do a quick review of the agenda. As Theresa already mentioned, we'll talk about the timing of the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT4). We'll go through just a few slides to anchor everybody's understanding and hope to spend a good time on Q&A and discussion. And then we'll talk about the Pilot Holistic Review as an update. And please let's go to the next slide.

With us today Theresa, of course, just opened up the session. I have a team, Reviews Support and Accountability team, and am very pleased to have with us today Evin here sitting next to me in person, Jason Kean dialing in remotely, and Yvette and actually Jessica as well also helping manage this session. So a hybrid approach, and we are hoping that everything goes smoothly.

I also wanted to acknowledge and recognize and welcome some, well, one Board member we have with us. Katrina, thank you for being here. Katrina, the chair of the organizational effectiveness committee. And also, I wanted to recognize several familiar faces from the third Accountability and Transparency Review, Pat Kane, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sebastien Bachollet. Thank you and I don't believe we have anybody else joining remotely from those two groups.

So without further ado, welcome to the session. Looking forward to a productive discussion. And, Jason, over to you.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you, Larisa. Good morning, everybody. Next slide, please, Yvette. We're going to start off by discussing the timing of ATRT4. Next slide, please, Yvette.

So a little stage setting here. As Theresa mentioned previously, the ICANN Reviews Program has two main parts. Specific reviews which make sure that the ICANN organization and ecosystem is maintaining its commitments. These are led by community review members, and they issue recommendations based on the entire ecosystem.

The second set, organizational reviews, review each structure. That's done by a third-party, and that's specific to structures and those issued recommendations there.

I'm not going to go into too much depth on either of these at this level. Specific reviews consist of the following reviews: Accountability and Transparency (ATRT); Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice; Registration Directory Service; and Security, Stability, and Resiliency.

The Accountability and Transparency Review, which I'm going to be referring to ATRT, issued a couple of recommendations to improve reviews—more than a couple. One of them related to specific reviews was a creation of a new specific review, the Holistic Review, which we're going to be providing an update on. And also a recommendation to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program.

And on here as well I'm just noting a project that Org is currently working on, Lifecycle of Reviews, to improve how specific reviews are managed and the procedures involved in managing and facilitating those reviews. Next slide, please.

A quick update on the status of ICANN reviews. Both the third Registration Directory Service Review and the third Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review have been deferred as a part of the third Accountability and Transparency Review's recommendation. The future of each will be determined by ATRT4.

The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review will occur following the closure of the next round. The ATRT4 was scheduled for April 2024, but we're going to be discussing the timing of that review shortly. And the Holistic Review has not been started, but there will be a decision made on the Holistic Review following the conclusion of the Pilot Holistic Review's work, which I will be providing an update on.

And finally, organizational reviews as I mentioned previously have all been deferred secondary to a recommendation to evolve them into a continuous improvement program. Just a note here though that the Board will be evaluating the progress and status of organizational reviews in June 2025. Next slide, please.

I just mentioned that a lot of reviews are either upcoming or currently deferred with dependencies, however there is a tremendous amount of work currently going on to implement previous review recommendations. So I would like to just highlight some of them.

Currently underway we have the development of the Continuous Improvement Program which I mentioned organizational reviews are currently evolving. This is requiring the participation of over 20 community members and a community coordination group which is underway. And I know there is a session at ICANN79 for them to get together and discuss their work. This is ongoing.

We have the Pilot Holistic Review which we anticipate having their inaugural meeting in September. We also have the implementation of Lifecycle of Reviews work as I mentioned previously focused on procedures of specific reviews. And then potentially on top of that we

would have the running of the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT4).

To note here that all of these projects require a significant amount of attention from the Board and community, and this is just related to reviews related work. We all know that ICANN ecosystem has a lot of other projects happening in parallel at the current moment in time. Next slide, please.

Considerations for the timing of ATRT4. There is a community directive. ATRT 3 Recommendation 3.5 stated that the launching of any other review activities should be suspended while a Pilot Holistic Review is active.

We also have community resources and priorities as I just mentioned. The community work on the Continuous Improvement Progress and Pilot Holistic Review along with other work constitutes a lot for community volunteers. And understanding everyone's bandwidth we wanted to include this as part of this conversation.

Next we have a precedent for deferring reviews. Organizational reviews were deferred in 2022, and SSR3 and RDS3, both specific reviews, were also deferred in 2022.

I'd like to highlight here another link to the letter that Theresa just sent out at the beginning of February requesting community input on the timing of ATRT4, including a lot of the information that I just reviewed as well as other specifics to solicit and facilitate conversation from the SO and AC chairs amongst their constituencies. Next slide, please.

Review

Now the fun part. Now that we have reviewed all the information and kind of got everybody up to speed, we'd really like to open up the floor to any questions, comments, so we can have an open discussion on this specific topic which is the timing of ATRT4. So at this point, I'd like to hand it over to Yvette. Yvette, please.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, do we have any questions? I don't have any in the Q&A pod at the moment, and I don't see any in the chat. Unless we have some questions in the physical room, anyone? Going once, going twice?

LARISA GURNICK: Sebastien has a question. Please, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay, I will do in English even if I...I'm sorry for interpreters. Maybe if we can go back to the slide with the agenda with the different reviews. First of all, I think it could be useful at least for me to know where we are in [inaudible] with the Holistic Review because it will have some maybe consequences is what I will say.

One part was not discuss and will I guess be discussed tomorrow during the CIP-CCG meeting, but I prefer to put the question here too even if we don't answer them right now. Please, can you go to the slide with the agenda, sorry, with the timeframe, timeline? It will be easier.

Review

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I'm going to scroll through slides. You just tell me which one you want, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The one before, I guess. Yeah, this one, please. Thank you. I have a few questions and a few comments. And you stop me when you think that I am taking too much time.

Regarding the CIP, I have the impression that we are having a chicken-and-egg problem because the definition of the framework development needs to take into [account] inputs, something done in the Continuous Improvement Program by the organizations within ICANN. And therefore, it's difficult to say, we don't have a continuous improvement program running and then at the same time asking for those groups to give information on how they are doing the continuous improvement program.

Therefore, why don't we start to have an organized CIP assessment program starting July 1 that we will be starting with a new fiscal year? Do we need the framework to start the CIP? I have the impression that at the end of the day we are requesting some [reverse] things because something coming from what we are doing in each and every structure of ICANN.

And I have a question with [the Board] reviewing in June 2025 as [inaudible] organizational reviews without real implementation of the evolution taking into account the CIP.

And if I can ask a question about ATRT4, before defining which date to start [there's] a question of the scope of ATRT4. It's important because even if it starts in one year or one and a half years, nothing really—not nothing—but the end of the process of implementing ATRT3, some of the ATRT3 recommendations specifically the Continuous Improvement Program and the Holistic Review, will not have been completely implemented. Therefore, I feel that ATRT4 may be organized but with the scope to be defined and not including at least those two issues because not yet done.

That's it for the moment. Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Sebastien. Let me take your first question on the continuous improvement program. And I believe that what you questioned is why do we need to develop the framework in order to start the continuous improvement efforts. And actually, it's a really good question. It definitely has to do with definitions of things, but as you and several other people around the table here are in fact participating in the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group—no acronyms today as much as I can help it—the group that has been assembled to first and foremost bring to the table information about what all the different groups are doing toward continuous improvement.

Because in fact, there are a lot of efforts as we inventoried a lot of efforts in the SOs and ACs and their constituent parts to improve things. These things are already going on. These things have always been going on.

And the point that we're at is to bring all of that into focus, take a look at all those efforts, but also using that work and using what's important to the individual structures to come up with a framework that could be consistent but flexible to be applied to all the SOs and ACs so that things could be tracked, reported, and measured across the ICANN ecosystem consistently.

So that's the work that's underway right now with the Community Coordination Group is to agree on the principles, criteria, and measures for how to bring that all together so that there is a means of reporting out publicly and also eventually that information would inform the Holistic Review when that time comes. So hopefully that explained the CIP point. But before I go on, can we just...did I get your question right?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, but even your answer you say that we are—and when I say “we” each part of ICANN is already doing continuous improvement program and they will bring that to the coordination group. And in the same time it's written that the Continuous Improvement Program assessment period will start at Q2 in '25. Why we don't start it now when it's feasible but not waiting for the end of the work about the framework?

Because the work of the framework will be even much more robust if we are organized officially starting continuous improvement what you call assessment period. I don't see in your answer something in contradiction with this possibility because in fact we are doing continuous improvement program already and fortunately because it's

what gives meat to the work of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you for that. So the other point I'd like to emphasize too is that I believe as Jason mentioned in June 2025 we anticipate reporting to the Board based on in response to the Board resolution a couple of years ago reporting to the Board a status update on where things are toward implementation of the continuous improvement program.

So the framework, community support and adoption of the framework, agreement across the board to use that framework and further status update of where all that work stands by June 2025 will inform the Board as to what to do next. Because the checkpoint in June 2025 is really intended to say should all the organizational reviews continue to be deferred because they will be replaced with this continuous improvement program, or is there a reason to restart the organizational reviews?

So the work of developing the framework, getting community support for the framework, and beginning the process is all intended to facilitate that checkpoint that will give the Board the information to make the determination. I don't know, Katrina, if you would like to add anything on that point, but that's what we're working toward.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, thank you very much, Larisa. And I see that Sebastien has some more input, so maybe I will wait until Sebastien has his point made.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Katrina. Yes, just to say definitely if the Board has to take a decision in June '25, it may be better if they have more information and one way to have more information is that we start the CIP assessment period. We don't need the framework to start the work. We need the framework to be set up and it will be useful, but we can start 1 July 2024 the CIP assessment period. At least there will be nine months of already working.

If not, then it will take the decision in Q2 and not in June to say, oh, don't need to do CIP. Stop the work. We will go back to the organizational reviews. Therefore, if it's—and I don't think it's the intention—and then if this intention is not there, it's better for the Board to have more information and one way to have more information is to start the CIP as soon as we can. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much, Sebastien. I absolutely agree with you. There's no need to wait until a formal framework to start continuous improvement within SOs, ACs, and SGs. And I know that many groups, ccNSO including, they already started working and that's fantastic.

But at the same time, I just want to note one more point that in the bylaws we have agreed that we are doing periodic reviews that we call organizational reviews. So if we want to completely rebuild what we're doing, we will need to change the bylaws. And for that we need a common understanding. For that we need agreement that, yes, that's where we're going.

Though I'd say that assessment would include that agreement among SOs and ACs but that does not mean that we should stop our continuous improvement efforts. On the contrary, I think they should be really encouraged and moved forward. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much, Katrina. I see that we have a question from Sophie, then Pat, and Tijani. Please, Sophie.

SOPHIE HEY:

Thank you. My question looking at this slide here, it's really helpful that we have it up there now, I'm a little rusty on my ATRT3 recommendations. Was it the intent of ATRT3 to then have ATRT4 evaluate the effectiveness of the Pilot Holistic Review or how that was actually developed and what it looks like? Or was that not considered and that's why we're starting to see some of the murkiness about the timing and in what order the different pieces of work happen?

LARISA GURNICK:

Thanks for the question, Sophie. Let me start and then because we do have former members of ATRT3 with us I'm sure that they will amplify on that point.

So in general, whenever a new review begins such as what we're talking about now, the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review, one of the primary objectives that they have would be to look back at prior review recommendations and see how those recommendations have

been implemented. And that goes across the board for all reviews. That's just the standard starting point.

So that's what ATRT4 would be looking at how the recommendations from their predecessor would have been implemented. And I think Sebastien actually alluded to that point in the fact that if ATRT4 were to begin soon on schedule, that information just simply wouldn't be ready because the work is still undergoing.

The other point that I wanted to make is when the Board approved the ATRT3 recommendation on the Holistic Review, to add the Holistic Review into the set of specific reviews, their directive was that there be a pilot.

And I know that there have been lengthy debates about what that meant, the pilot, and we spent the last two and a half years or so trying to define what the Terms of Reference would be for the pilot. But the idea as it stands right now is that the pilot or this work effort that we will provide you with an update on very shortly, the group of community members would look at how the eventual Holistic Review would be carried out, how things would be evaluated, and there's a whole list of deliverables.

So the job of the pilot is to build all that out. Make sure that there's community support for how that would work because there will be quite a lot of participation and assessment of the SOs and ACs and their various structures. And eventually basically hand to the Board and the community a set of guidelines and criteria for how the eventual Holistic Review would be carried out.

Then the Board would ensure, would want to take a look and see if the outcomes from that work satisfied all the points that they envisioned for the pilot to address and they would also look to the community to make sure that the community is supportive of this effort in general.

Then that would lead to initiation of bylaws amendment which would entail also public comment and all that. And eventually, the Holistic Review would be enshrined in the bylaws. And at that point we would be talking about the group of specific reviews that incorporates the Holistic Review along with the others.

So sorry for the longwinded explanation but hopefully that helped address your question.

SOPHIE HEY:

It did, and I really appreciate the longer explanation and the thoroughness of it. It was really helpful to hear that. So if I'm understanding correctly, there's a potential situation where we go through and we do the Pilot Holistic Review and then that is assessed and whether it's taken forward into the Holistic Review for the bylaws. So that's a consideration made by the Board and presumably the OEC. And then it's also then reviewed in ATRT4. Is that a possible outcome, or have I wildly misunderstood?

LARISA GURNICK:

Yeah, as far as the OEC is concerned, and Katrina can again amplify, the organizational effectiveness committee of the Board is the one that oversees all the work having to do with reviews. And then we go through

the OEC and the OEC makes recommendations to the Board. So OEC in a way is a conduit toward Board action.

As to the second part of your statement, ideally by the time ATRT4 is assembled all of that would have already taken place so that they could take a look at that and connect the dots. And Pat or Cheryl, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Better let Pat because I'm about to jump out of my seat] [inaudible].

PAT KANE: This is Pat Kane, co-chair ATRT3. Thank you, Cheryl. Sophie, great question, and it really was the basis for the intervention that I was going to jump in on. And that is that by this point in time when we finished ATRT3 we actually thought that we'd be done with the Holistic Review. And so based upon the introduction of the pilot which was appropriate as well as COVID all-remote participation in events I think we ended up in a spot where we never thought we'd be talking about it today toward when do we start ATRT4.

One of the things that we did make a deliberate decision within ATRT3, or at least Cheryl and I steered the group that way, was to not try to do an investigation on items that were in flight. So one of the topics that came up specifically was like the proposed .org acquisition. And so people wanted to look at that, but it wasn't done. It was in flight.

And so one of the recommendations that I would make, and Sebastien and I talked about this a little bit yesterday, was continue with ATRT4 because there are many, many things that aren't the recommendations

that came out of ATRT3 that should be investigated and should be talked about and reviewed.

So if you were to take in-flight items off the table for ATRT4—so again the Holistic Review, the prioritization processes that we put in place—and continue on that path, it would probably be appropriate for us to start ATRT4 on time if you take those pieces out. Because I don't think we had ever thought we would actually be here without the Holistic Review being done.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Pat. And I think Tijani is next. Please, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. I am a little bit confused when I hear that we have to start now the continuous improvement. We are doing continuous improvement now and we have continued to do it. We are doing it in our silos in our manners in each constituency. My understanding of what [Evin] is proposing for us is to report to the coordination group what we are doing now and trying to find a coordinated way to use a better way to do it. And starting the continuous improvement means starting it in this way, with this coordinated way which they call the framework.

So in my opinion, we are all speaking the same language. We are continuing to do the continuous improvement, but we will do it according to the framework when we finish it. That's all.

Review

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Tijani. I see Jason has his hand up. Jason, please.

JASON KEAN: Thanks, Larisa. Yeah, to your point, Tijani, I think the thing to keep in mind is there's an element of reporting out continuous improvement efforts. And with the ATRT3 recommendation on the development of the continuous improvement program, there needs to be some sort of cohesion so that when all that information is reported as per the group now what principles exist and how they're reporting it so that information can be interpreted.

Eventually, that information would be an output and an input into the Holistic Review. So the coordination of that information and the consistency of how it's being reported by the different groups is really what this is speaking to. Those efforts are, of course, underway but the lens by which they're being reported, that is the element of the development of the framework. And I think moving forward when you look at the CIP assessment period it's reflective of the reporting within that context. I hope that's helpful.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Jason. And before we move—oh, I see Sebastien has his hand up. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, if we are doing a continuous improvement program and we are reporting to the CIP-CCG therefore why we wait for Q2 '25 to say that we are doing CIP assessment period? Sorry, I will be blunt, but you want

[other] ways to put things together before we start the work. We don't need a way to report all the same.

It will be...we have two periods of three years to do some work to report to the possibly one day eventually Holistic Review. Therefore, let's put aside the Holistic Review. Let's do the Continuous Improvement Program. If we find a framework with commonality, great. If we don't, it doesn't matter. We can still do Continuous Improvement Program in each and every of our organizations, therefore why we wait for Q2 to say we are doing Continuous Improvement Program and the same time saying we are doing it now. If we are doing it now, let's start the assessment period now. And that's my proposal.

It's in between to say 1 July that we are in the fiscal year with the question of budget to help with the Continuous Improvement Program and so on and so forth. But I can also say let's start tomorrow morning what you call CIP assessment period. That's to be really clear what is as the discussion.

And no, we can disagree. That's okay. At the end of the day, we will do what we decide, but don't say we agree. No, we disagree. At least what I understand, it's a disagreement here. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

If I may respond, thank you, Seb, for bringing up these comments. I know you're also a representative of EURALO and the Community Coordination Group. We are looking to evolve organizational reviews into a Continuous Improvement Program.

Review

And as Jason noted as well, we need kind of a structure or way to inform the Holistic Review of the activities of the structures. So we need some commonality, especially when we're replacing these activities without an independent examiner, and agreement across the community about common principles and then customizable criteria for each structure.

And just having 21 representatives in this group it will take some time for the group to relay these inputs to their structures and stakeholder groups. And our timeline is about 12 months. We're hoping to have this framework by the end of this calendar year. But of course, if this work proceeds faster, we can adjust this timeline.

So we want to ensure that the community is well aware of this work and is in agreement to it before we move forward with the assessment period. I hope this helps clarify.

LARISA GURNICK:

Pat, please.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Larisa. So, Seb, I'm going to try to be a little bit more blunt. You know, the topic is ATRT4 and what we're trying to do here. And unless the proposal is that we wait to start ATRT4 until the CIP is in place and rolling, then I'm not sure why we're talking about the CIP right now.

So I understand the issues and the concerns, but if we're taking a look at when to start ATRT4, is that your suggestion that we wait until the CIP is formally declared, formally begun? I mean, because I know our original calendar is completely shot in terms of where we are today, but

I think we ought to make the appropriate and pragmatic suggestions to move forward on things that are important, which I think ATRT4 starting is.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay, thank you, Pat. Cheryl, I see your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Yvette. Surely I can project to get to that [inaudible]. Let me know if I can't be heard. Looking at our timelines up on the screen here, just to be clear I think there's plenty of worthy work for a specifically focused and quite tightly mandated ATRT4 to get on with. And as Pat puts it, what's not on the table is for a later time and we'll just have what's in flight and what's not in flight separate.

But yes, recognize that there is an [impost] on the resourcing of all of this the way it's currently lined up and certainly the community resourcing of all this the way it's currently lined up. But the work products should be easy enough distinguished and separate. There may be some complementarity. There's bound to be some overlap. There hopefully shouldn't be too many dependencies. And maybe if all we do is shift one quarter on either, then we're not having the [impost] and the potential for confusion at the community when we are going out for public comment and reporting and things like that on two very parallel processes.

So to me, a minor adjustment on one or other of the Pilot Holistic Review or ATRT4 should give us just enough wiggle room to make sure

we're not overwhelming the community with what looks like two very similar sorts of exercises. And yet if we can get the resourcing right, and that needs a lot of proper prior planning to do that, I would suggest that would be worthy work indeed. But as Pat clearly said, our original timeline is just gone. This is where we are. Now we have to do the best we can with what we've got.

And I guess for me empowering enough information and material for the formality of shifting away from these periodic, spasmodic, whatever we want to call them organizational reviews—I'm trying not to sneer as I say that because I will tend to—and into what Recommendation 3.6 desired which is an organizational wide effective continuous improvement program which is not just one thing but a weaving of the individual component parts into a stronger overall structure and framework, I think that work can go on in parallel.

And I honestly think that there are enough of us in the community to split our interests and get on with the job. But it is going to be costly. It is going to take a lot of effort. But it does need to be very tightly focused works that are designed. We don't need things getting bigger than "Ben Hur." Thanks.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Thank you, Cheryl. Avri, please.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I wanted to go back to where Sophie started the questions and say why do we do part of the ATRT4 and doesn't it come now. And

remembering that the ATRTs are supposed to be the bottom-up oversight of what Board and the staff and such are doing in their treatment of the community and their treatment of the organization. And certainly having been in a position to have heard enough sorrow and gnashing of teeth about what Board and staff have been doing, how they treated the recommendations of ATRT3, think getting an ATRT4 starting as soon as it is feasible balancing everything that Cheryl and others have said is actually quite important at this time. I think there's sort of a bottom-up oversight freefall of...they made recommendations, the Board, and I was among the guilty. The Board made decisions one way or another on those. It is now ATRT4's chance to judge how they treated that. How did that go? How is that going on? How is accountability being treated by the Board and the Org? So I think it's a perfect time to do one.

LARISA GURNICK: Avri, you may have frozen at the end, but it also sounded like a very impactful mic drop moment. Very, very good.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry. I thought I had finished. Sorry.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. Any other comments? Any other observations before we switch gears into the update on the Pilot Holistic Review? Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just one small comment and [inaudible] this discussion, I think what Cheryl said about possible confusion about the two reviews, it's very, very, very important. And it's maybe the thing we need to guide us on what we implement first and how we implement it. And in just my personal point of view I think we need to go out first of the Pilot Holistic Review because we are waiting for so long. And I will say as soon as it's started, that the group is set up, maybe we can take it...start the ATRT4 with all the things we have to say about the content and so on. But I feel that what is important in this discussion is what Cheryl says about the confusion. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much. And just to wrap up the ATRT4 discussion, as Theresa mentioned we are hoping to get feedback from the SOs and ACs by toward the end of March. There is an OEC meeting and a Board meeting to consider and consider all the feedback and make a determination regarding ATRT4 timing.

And of course, we will continue to be interested and eager to have discussions with all of you as well as many others that were not able to join today. So we'll continue to make ourselves available and have these productive dialogues and answer questions and to Sebastien's point also make sure that there is clear understanding between the different components. Because we also hear a lot of questions about how these various pieces connect and relate to each other. So that will all be ongoing.

And with that, I will turn it back over to Jason for a quick update on the Pilot Holistic Review. Jason?

JASON KEAN:

Thanks, Larisa, and I'll try to be as quick as possible so we can return to the discussion on this topic. So a quick history of the Holistic Review recommendation from ATRT3. ATRT3 examined how ICANN reviews function. They developed this recommendation calling for a new holistic review, a specific review. And the Board approved this recommendation with caveats. Namely [as Theresa noted] prioritization, availability of resources, and the biggest community agreed Terms of Reference. Next slide, please.

So the exercise of developing a community agreed Terms of Reference actually has undergone—I'll just go through the timeline first. It started with the ToR development team drafting an initial draft. Then it went for community consultation via public comment. The output of that public comment was then used by the ToR team to revise their Terms of Reference based on the input that was received. Then the community was consulted again on a public comment on the revised draft.

The Board at their Montevideo workshop received an update from the OEC on the status of this last public comment proceeding, and they provided some additional advice on this. So they suggested that they agreed in concept with proceeding with the Pilot Holistic Review provided that the OEC give the Pilot Holistic Review team additional guidance via the Terms of Reference to address the outstanding pieces in the last public comment proceeding.

And just to note that this exercise just eclipsed over two years to develop this into community agreed Terms of Reference. Next slide, please.

In terms of what the Pilot Holistic Review team would do, they would address Board gaps, proposed bylaws language, skillsets for volunteers, resources for required eventual holistic reviews, measurements of success. They'd also develop guidelines for the Holistic Review objectives, and those are listed here. And [with time allotting] test guidelines for Holistic Review objectives thereafter. Next slide, please.

What would the next steps after the Pilot Holistic Review be? The final report would be sent to the Board. The Board would open a public comment to inform its decision. The Board would then consider the information provided to see if there's sufficient community support, all information gaps have been addressed, and will initiate then the process for a bylaws amendment. Following that point, standard bylaws procedures would be followed to enshrine the language in the bylaws. Next slide, please.

A roadmap—oh, there are my icons—we're looking to start a call for volunteers in April. We're looking to position the inaugural meeting in September. And part of the timeline that we're looking to do, there is language stating that there is a maximum...this work should be completed in a maximum of 18 months. But going on back to the Terms of Reference agreement taking over two years, we are looking to expedite the process of the review team within 14 to 15 months allotting for additional time for community involvement.

And a big reason that approach and discussion is happening with the Board is we want to be able to have room for that discussion while the review team is still seated, while this topic is still hot on everybody's minds and we can resolve any outstanding disagreements and achieve alignment within this time period. Again reflecting on the time period we had to resolve outstanding components with the Holistic Review being two years, we feel that this is an appropriate timeline to do that and would actually afford a supplemental public comment proceeding following a draft report as well. Next slide, please.

Now I think another fun part, so we'll open the floor back up to questions. So I'm going to hand it back over to Yvette. And Larisa, please, if there's anything you'd like to add.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Yeah, I don't have any questions in the Q&A pod. I don't have any in the chat. There may be some hands up in the room that I'm not seeing possibly. No? Okay.

LARISA GURNICK:

Sebastien, please. It looked a quick hand.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, I do have two things. The first one if we can start before, it would be great and why to wait to September to the inaugural Pilot Holistic Review team meeting?

Review

My second comment is that whatever is decided, let's do it. We are waiting so much, and let's go. But maybe you can add one point. It's during the northern hemisphere summer you maybe have all to gather data to help the Pilot Holistic Review to work. Whatever data needs to be gathered like that September meeting will be not just a presentation of the people but also knowledge of some background document, some data points, and so on and so forth. Thank you very much.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you, Sebastien. That's actually...can we go to the previous slide really quickly, Yvette? That's a great point, Sebastien, because I mentioned the Lifecycle of Reviews earlier and the procedures for running specific reviews. At that inaugural meeting in September, that would be the start of the work. We do have the benefit of a Terms of Reference already being drafted. We have the ability to work with the seated review team. You can see that to announce the review team we're looking for July. We have the ability to start formulating a workplan or a proposed workplan and information and materials floated so that it's hitting the ground running in September. And I think that's part of, just reflecting back on the Lifecycle of Reviews, a lot of that procedural operational work that we're looking to implement to better support review teams going forward and help them better manage the process using best project management principles and methodologies. And so you're spot on. That's exactly the plan, and I really appreciated hearing that come from you, so thank you.

EN

Review

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Jason. Looking around the room, any other comments, questions on the Pilot Holistic Review, ATRT4, or anything else related to this topic? All right, not seeing any comments or questions, I would like to thank you all for participating. Thank you for the robust discussion, and we are looking forward to ongoing conversations leading up to some actions in April. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]