
ICANN79 | Prep Week – ICANN Reviews Update
Thursday, February 22, 2024 – 2:00 to 3:30 SJU

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN Reviews Update on Thursday, February 22, at 18:00 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux. And Madeleine Werbelow, Sara Sarraf, and myself will be your remote participation managers for this webinar which is being recorded and will be posted online shortly after we conclude. This session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During the session, questions or comments submitted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud at the time set aside for question and answer. Questions written in the chat will be considered part of the chat and may not be read aloud for the record. If you have a comment or a question you would like addressed during the Q&A discussion portions at the end of each presentation. Feel free to either raise your hand or please we really encourage you to use the Q&A pod you can find at the bottom of your Zoom toolbar. And those noted formations on how to do things are posted in the chat.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, and Portuguese. Click on the interpretation ICANN in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking,

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.

be sure to mute all of the devices and notifications, and please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

This session also includes automated real-time transcription. So please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcript, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name.

Okay. I believe that about does it for me. If we can go to the agenda slide and I will be handing things over to our Vice President of Implementation Operations, Giovanni Seppia. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Yvette. Thank you so much for the introduction. This session is about reviews, which are an important accountability mechanism required by ICANN Bylaws, and they are critical to maintaining a healthy multistakeholder model. Specifically, reviews are managed by two departments that work in close cooperation. The Review Support and Accountability department, which is led by Larisa Gurnick and is in charge of preparing the review and support the review process until the outcome of the review is delivered to the ICANN Board, and the Implementation Operations department, which I'm in charge of and I'm leading and is responsible for the implementation of Board-approved non-policy recommendations coming from Specific Reviews and Cross-Community Working Groups.

Today, Prep Week webinar starts. It's divided in two main sections. The first one is a session whose core part is the implementation of specific recommendations coming from the third iteration of the Accountability and Transparency Review, the so-called ATRT3, as well as an update on the Lifecycle of Review Project.

The second part is a session that will offer an overall update on the implementation of Specific Review recommendations and recommendations coming from announcing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2 process. The session is going to highlight the great progress and that we've made together so far, as well as the work that is in the pipeline. With many thanks to all the community members and ICANN colleagues that have been supporting this process so far. I'm going to pass the floor on to Jason Kean from the Review Support and Accountability department. Jason, the floor is yours.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. So to start this webinar off, we're going to, as Giovanni noted, discuss ICANN Reviews Program and provide some updates. And presenting for this portion will be the Review Support Accountability Team.

I'd like to introduce the leadership part first, Theresa Swinehart, Senior Vice President of Global Domains and Strategy. As Giovanni mentioned, Larisa Gurnick, the Vice President of Reviews Support and Accountability. Presenting today, we have Evin Erdoğan, who is a project manager for Reviews Support and Accountability. Myself,

Jason Kean, a manager for projects within the department, and Yvette Guigneaux, who is coordinating everything behind the scenes.

To kick us off, I'd like to actually hand it over to ICANN Board member and current chair of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, Katrina Sataki, to say a few words. Katrina, please.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Jason. And welcome, everyone. I also would like to start by thanking the team for preparing the slides, preparing material to present to you today. It's really a huge amount of information that you will receive today. I hope that you will enjoy the webinar. Also, we'll have a lot of questions that we'll try to answer.

As Jason already mentioned, I'm chairing the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee. And that is the committee which is responsible for the oversight of Specific Reviews, as you can see them on this slide, and also Organizational Reviews, as they are all mandated by the ICANN Bylaws. The oversight also covers the work of the implementation of those recommendations that are generated by these reviews, as well as the ongoing work to improve the process of the reviews to make it more effective and efficient.

As you all may know, reviews give the global stakeholder community important and necessary tools to ensure the bottom-up oversight of what we all do here at ICANN. For example, reviews help us to influence how ICANN is structured or how ICANN ensures accountability and transparency.

Of course, we also need to continuously grow and become more effective and efficient. Therefore, there are currently several interlinked work efforts underway to improve ICANN Reviews. The Lifecycle of Reviews Project, again, you can see it on the slide, that is an effort by the ICANN Organization to improve the process of Specific Reviews by addressing challenges that have been identified by the community, the Board, and Org over the course of several review cycles that we have been through so far. For example, the project proposes the ways to increase the positive impact of reviews to benefit the multistakeholder community and the call to decrease the resources and time that Specific Reviews take.

Two additional work efforts I'd like to mention here, they are a target to improve reviews—and those recommendations originated from the third Accountability and Transparency Review. For example, Recommendation 3.6 calls for the creation of a Continuous Improvement Program. Again, you can see it here on the slide. This will require evolving Organizational Reviews run every five years. So we can call this process occasional improvement. It's a program or a process of continuous improvement.

Recommendation 3.5 calls for the creation of a new Specific Review. Again, you can see on the slide Holistic Review. The Holistic Review will assess the continuing purpose, accountability, and Continuous Improvement Programs of Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the Nominating Committee.

Again, this is the summary slide that'll give you insight of what we're going to talk about today. I could talk for hours, but I already see that

the team is getting nervous because there's really a lot of information they would like to share with you today. Therefore, I will stop talking and give the floor back to Jason. Thank you very much and enjoy the webinar.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you very much, Katrina. That was a great overview to get us started. I really appreciate it. So as Katrina noted, we're going to get into ICANN Reviews. So quickly, to give a quick overview of the status of reviews at this point in time, the third Registration Directory Service Review and the third Security Stability and Resiliency Review have both been deferred secondary to an ATRT3 recommendation. The future of both of those reviews will be determined by a fourth Accountability and Transparency Review.

The Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review 2 will be scheduled following the next round after the next round closes.

The fourth Accountability and Transparency Review, which is actually scheduled as per the Bylaws to start no later than April of 2024, is currently in the process of consultation with the community on its timing. There is an ATRT3 recommendation which states that no review work shall be undertaken while a Holistic Review is active. And the Board is actually expected to make a determination on the Pilot Holistic Review in April. So there could be overlap there. More on that in a moment.

And finally, for Specific Reviews, we have the Holistic Review, which its future will actually be determined following the conclusion of the Pilot

Holistic Review’s work and the Board’s consideration of said work and community support.

So that’s a quick overview of the status of Specific Reviews. Organizational Reviews, as Katrina noted from the previous slide, have all been deferred secondary to an ATRT3 recommendation that they should evolve into a Continuous Improvement Program. That work is already underway, and my colleague, Evin, will be updating you on that in a moment. The Board is slated to evaluate the progress of this work in June of 2025.

The previous slide showed that all reviews currently either had a future date or currently deferred. But this is showing you that we are still actively involved in the implementation of review recommendations from previous reviews. To highlight some of the areas that you’ve just heard about, the development of a framework for the Continuous Improvement Program is currently underway. Evin will touch on that. Planning for the Pilot Holistic Review is actively underway, and that will be discussed as well. As Katrina noted, so is work for the Lifecycle of Reviews to improve work. Now we would like to take a moment to discuss the status of the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review. So we’ll move on to that subject now.

So, as I mentioned, the timing of this is currently in community consultation, some key areas of consideration regarding the timing of ATRT4. As I mentioned, there’s a community directive. ATRT3 Recommendation 3.5, as I noted, said that the launching of any other review activity should be suspended while Holistic Review is active. Given the Board will be making a determination on the Pilot Holistic

Review in April, this is a paramount thing to discuss now as there will be overlapping. In regards to that overlapping, a consideration is also community resources and priorities. Community bandwidth, Board bandwidth, and Org bandwidth as well will be taken up with the work involved to create the Continuous Improvement Program framework as well as to plan for launch and support a Pilot Holistic Review. And as we know, beyond reviews, there's a lot of other work going on occupying everyone's volunteer time as well.

And lastly, there's also a precedent for deferring reviews. So I mentioned previously, Organizational Reviews, SSR3 and RDS3, are all deferred in 2022, secondary to ATRT3 recommendations. So there is consistency and there's precedent for this. And just to note that deferral of ATRT4 would kind of allow for the ability to tackle some of this.

So at this point, this section is broken up into different parts for questions, so we stay specific to the topic. So we're actually going to open up for two minutes of questions. At this point, I will actually hand it over to Yvette to see if there's any questions in the queue or if anyone has any questions they'd like answered.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay, I do have one that popped up in the queue in the Q&A, and then I do have a hand raised. So I'm going to kind of go in the order of received. Okay. I have a Q&A question in the Q&A pod from Sébastien. Why April for the Board to review the Pilot Holistic Review?

-
- JASON KEAN: Okay. Thank you for that question. Sébastien. So the Board actually discussed this. This was the OEC, Organizational Effectiveness Committee, brought this to the Board. I'm going to provide a little bit more information about that later. But there's one additional action item for the OEC to undertake. Officially, the Board is expected to take action on the Pilot Holistic Review to initiate all activities in April. I will provide some more context and perhaps we'll have some more questions after that point.
- YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. All right. Thank you for that, Jason. Okay. And then we have a hand raise from Greg DiBiase. If I butchered your last name, I profusely apologize. So please go ahead and unmute yourself and ask your question.
- GREG DIBIASE: No, perfect pronunciation. So my question is just regarding what the Board is considering in April, like is there a specific question before the Board? What about the Pilot Holistic Review exactly?
- JASON KEAN: Thank you for your question, Greg. Officially, what happened is the OEC brought to the Board the idea of proceeding with the Pilot Holistic Review based off of analysis of the public comments and what they perceive to be the best direction for that review to take. I'll get ahead of myself just to answer this question because Sébastien brought it up as well. To thoroughly address all concerns that were raised in the last

Public Comment proceeding, some additional elements and guidance will be included in the Terms of Reference to ensure that all bases are covered in terms of outstanding pieces from the last Public Comment proceeding. So this is essentially due diligence to make sure that everything that was raised with the community is actively addressed. And in April, it's expected to be an official memorialization of next steps to initiate call for volunteers and all subsequent activities. Did that answer your question, Greg?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Greg, are you with us? Did that answer your question?

GREG DIBIASE:

Sorry. Yeah, I think so. So the question before the Board was the feedback and public comment properly incorporated as a community feedback incorporated, as opposed to a higher level question of whether this should go forward.

JASON KEAN:

That is absolutely correct, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

Got it. Thank you.

JASON KEAN:

You're welcome.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Let me just check the Q&A pod. Those questions were answered. That was only Sébastien, and that was Greg. I don't see any more hands up.

JASON KEAN: Okay. Excellent. Thank you, Yvette. Again, we will be pausing through the first part of the session for two minutes to answer any questions. So I will continue this part of the presentation. So this actually goes right into the Pilot Holistic Review.

So quick history, I'm sure everyone's very familiar with this. ICANN Bylaws required ATRT3 to be convened. ATRT3 examined how reviews function. ATRT3 recommended that there be the creation of a new Specific Review, the Holistic Review. And the Board approved this recommendation with caveats. One, most notably that it proceeds as a pilot, and two, that it proceeds pursuant to a community agreed Terms of Reference. There have been two Public Comment proceedings on this Terms of Reference, as I just mentioned in answering those questions. Some concerns were noted. And due diligence along the way with the OEC has been about ensuring that those concerns are adequately addressed before ICANN Org and the entire community proceed with that review.

So what would the Holistic Review look at? I'm hoping a lot of you are familiar with this as well. To review continuous improvement efforts of SO, AC, NomCom based on good practices. To review the effectiveness of the various SO and AC, NomCom collaboration mechanisms. To review the accountability of SO, AC or constituent parts to their

members and constituencies. And perhaps the most popular, review SO and AC, NomCom as a whole to determine if they continue to have a purpose or if any changes are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN.

I do have some notes on this that I just would like to share a quick update on, as I mentioned. So the Board at its last workshop did agree in concept to proceed with a Pilot Holistic Review, provided that the OEC gives the Pilot Holistic Review Team additional guidance via the Terms of Reference. So just to reiterate this element, to ensure that everything is addressed, the OEC is actively working to document how it's going to address outstanding concerns and how those elements are going to be integrated into the Terms of Reference to ensure that that guidance is taken on board and everything proceeds accordingly. It will present that to the Board in a special Board session in April.

And now on to timing, which I think is what Sébastien was curious about as well. So considering special Board session would be sometime in April, potentially in accordance with ATRT4 deferral for the timing decision. We're hoping to start a call for volunteers sometime in April as well. Review Team selection to follow. And the big target I'd like to focus everybody's attention on is aiming for an inaugural Pilot Holistic Review meeting in September of 2024.

So I know that's a lot of information. We just covered some previously. So at this point, I'd like to pause for any questions, even though I do know and acknowledge that a couple have already asked on this subject. Yvette, please.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. No problem. I don't see any in the Q&A pod. But I do see Chris Disspain has his hand up. So please go ahead and unmute and ask your question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hang on a second. I just need to—

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I completely understand.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Can you hear me properly now?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: We can hear you clearly. Go ahead, sir.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Yvette. Jason, could we go back to just two slides to the actual—the one before? Just to be clear, that is the Holistic Review. That's not the Pilot Holistic Review. That's actually what a Holistic Review looks like. Is that right?

JASON KEAN: That is correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay, cool. So that is not what the Pilot—I just wanted to make sure that there wasn't any misunderstanding.

JASON KEAN: No. Sorry.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Go ahead. Go ahead.

JASON KEAN: Oh, okay. That's a great point, Chris. And apologies. The work of the pilot is actually to operationalize all these elements that you see in front of you. That's the entire purview of it. And given the sensitivities and some of the complexities around these objectives that are in the Holistic Review, the goal is to make sure that the process by which it is operationalized is thorough and all community concerns are considered in that process.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Brilliant, Jason. Thanks very much.

JASON KEAN: Absolutely. Great question, Chris. I appreciate it.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. I don't have anything in the Q&A pod and I do not see any hands up at the moment.

JASON KEAN:

Okay. Excellent. If we do have time at the end, if anyone does have any questions, we hopefully will be able to get to them as well. So at this point, I appreciate everybody's time. I'd like to hand it over to my colleague, Evin for the Continuous Improvement Program.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thanks so much, Jason. Hello, everyone. This is Evin Erdoğan speaking. In addition to ATRT3 Recommendation 3.5 for the Holistic Review, ATRT3 also issued Recommendation 3.6, which calls for Organizational Reviews to be evolved into a Continuous Improvement Program. There are community perceived shortcomings of Organizational Reviews which led to the development of this recommendation. The shortcomings include the level of understanding and competence of the independent examiners that have conducted these reviews and the quality of their recommendations. The volume of recommendations has also proven challenging to implement. The ICANN Board directed ICANN Org to initiate the implementation of a Pilot Continuous Improvement Program to ensure it yields the outcomes intended by the ATRT3 Recommendation 3.6 before a Bylaws amendment is completed.

During the community prioritization cycle in 2022, this recommendation was designated as a top priority for implementation. That year, ICANN Org received broad support from all of the community to defer the next scheduled Organizational Reviews to plan for implementation of this Continuous Improvement Program.

Accordingly, the ICANN Board deferred the next cycle of Organizational Reviews, and the Board will consider the progress made toward evolving Organizational Reviews in June 2025. The output from the Continuous Improvement Program will also serve as input to the eventual Holistic Review as my colleague, Jason, noted. Next slide, please. Thank you.

ICANN Org began to organize working sessions with the community on the development of the Continuous Improvement Program framework with the formation of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group or CIP-CCG. They held their first meeting in January and the group has been regularly meeting every two weeks.

The ICANN community demonstrated strong interest in contributing to the evolution of Organizational Reviews with 21 out of the 22 groups across the ICANN community represented in this Community Coordination Group. The represent initiatives other groups are sharing best practices and are collaborating on the community-wide implementation of ATRT3 Recommendation 3.6, while relaying information back to their constituencies to inform the development of a framework.

The role of the Community Coordination Group is to conduct an inventory of existing continuous improvement activities, consider the methodologies and frameworks for the effective continuous improvement, and formulate a Continuous Improvement Program framework to be used by each ICANN structure. The framework for the Continuous Improvement Program will provide a common base of

principles between all SOs, ACs, and the NomCom, but will also allow for customization of criteria so as to best meet the needs of each individual structure. Next slide, please. Thank you.

This is the overall roadmap for the Continuous Improvement Program to show where the ICANN Community, Org, and Board are in the process. So currently, we're in the initial development phase for Continuous Improvement Program framework development by the community with the goal of publishing a framework for public comment hopefully by the end of this year. The framework will be published for public comment by the Community Coordination Group before adoption by each SO, AC, and the NomCom. And the group will also address input received and revise the framework where relevant.

Upon adoption of the framework, the first Continuous Improvement Program assessment period would begin. The first assessment period is estimated to begin upon adoption of the framework, which the earliest anticipated date would be the first quarter of 2025, and it's estimated to take up to three years, so it would potentially conclude in 2027. And then the second assessment period, similarly, would be another three years. The results of these assessments will inform the eventual Holistic Review.

Overall, the implementation of this recommendation is an opportunity to support meaningful improvements within the ICANN community, including toward improved governance and to be more relevant to the ICANN community. So with that, I'll pause here for any questions.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Let's see. Giovanni? Please go ahead, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Hi, Evin. Thank you. I just noticed in the chat there are several ICANN79 Fellows that are attending this session. So, first of all, I would like to welcome them. But also I would like to invite them to ask any question they may have, as sometimes we tend to give for granted to what we speak about. But in this case, we are talking about newcomers. So feel free to intervene and ask for further information, clarification. Sometimes ICANN language tends to be really cryptic. So let's open the doors to further clarification, if needed. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. I have a hand up from Greg DiBiase. Please go ahead and unmute and ask your question.

GREG DIBIASE: So the framework, the Continuous Improvement framework that will be developed and assessed will then be considered by the Holistic Review. Are these initiatives going in parallel? Or is the idea that the framework when completed then the Holistic Review begins?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Greg. So there's a relationship between the two Recommendations 3.5 for the Holistic Review and 3.6 for the Continuous Improvement Program. So, currently, we're just getting started with the Continuous Improvement Program, and it's a pilot at

this stage. But the community is developing a framework that would be used for the assessment, and the assessment would inform the Holistic Review. I hope that helps clarify the relationship.

JASON KEAN:

If I could, really quickly, to add on to what Evin said. This is Jason speaking, Greg. To Evin's point, the Continuous Improvement Program framework is being developed in parallel. At the conclusion of that framework, ideally, there would be cycles that each of the groups would use to document their own continuous improvement. And that would then be reported on. And a eventual Holistic Review would leverage the reporting of those continuous improvement efforts to inform the objectives that they would be looking at, if that makes sense.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thank you both.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay. Let me go ahead and check the Q&A pod. No, I don't have any questions in there. Currently, I don't see any hands raised. Going once, going twice. Sébastien, right on time. Please go ahead and unmute and ask your question, sir.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Always too late. No, I just want to be sure for a few things. The first one is that there is no—I will say in another way. We don't

need to fulfill the two CIP evolution for the Holistic Review. What was meant in the ATRT3 to have what it's done by the community at the CIP level to get information to the Holistic Review, what is at stake at that moment. Because we could centralize everything, but then the Holistic Review and ATRT4 will be in 10 years. That's the first thing.

The second, just to be clear, the three years, where did it come from? It come from that we—when I say “we,” as a community, org, and eventually the Board—will not have the capacity to do all in one year, all the AC, SO, RALO, constituency, and so on, in one year. It's why it's three years. Each year will be with different SO/AC to report. At least it was what was suggested in the ATRT3 recommendation. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Thank you, Sébastien. I don't see any more questions. I don't see the hands up. I don't see anyone else in the Q&A pod. Evin, unless you have any more remarks, I think we're onto the next session.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Yeah. I'll hand it back over to Jason, actually. Jason, please.

JASON KEAN:

Great. Thank you, Evin. Thank you, Sébastien. Moving on to Lifecycle Reviews Project, which was touched on earlier. A quick history on this project. So ICANN has conducted eight Specific Reviews following the Affirmation of Commitments in 2009. The ICANN Board undertook work to improve Specific Reviews, which have been paused while ATRT3 was active. ICANN Org initiated the Lifecycle of Reviews Project

to continue the Board’s work and to build on the lessons learned over numerous review cycles.

Some numbers for Specific Reviews, so everyone understands what’s at stake here. And these are the resources required to support the last four Specific Reviews. 10,000 hours of community time by 62 volunteer members. And just to break that down a little bit, about an average of 60% participation rate by community volunteers. If you dig a little bit deeper into that, you’ll see that along the way, that ended up being close to 100% participation for a handful of volunteers, as there was some attrition in the review itself. Roughly 20,000 hours of support provided by ICANN Org, and a total price tag of \$3.4 million was spent to support the work of these four Specific Review Teams.

Again, just for further context, this is just while the review is active. This is not pre-planning, and this is not the cost or time or work associated with implementation. This is just actually running the review.

So if we look at an opportunity for improvement, the Board took action on 125 recommendations. Of the initial action by the Board, 31% were approved on the first pass within the required six months. 43% were placed into Pending category, requiring additional clarity or resolution of dependencies. 14% were rejected as not feasible. And 12% were directed to the community groups outside of ICANN’s remit to approve or reject.

Again, just noting here, you’ll find this in the Implementation Operations presentation. A majority of this work is ongoing and it has

taken a substantial amount of not just Org’s time to provide clarity and get these implemented, but additionally, community members that participated, and the Board as well.

If we look at aspirational goals for the Lifecycle Overviews Project, we would like to target the actual review which is conducting the review work for less than 12 months. We believe there’s a lot of factors that contribute to streamlining this process, this process including research, analysis, problem and opportunity identification, a recommendation development through submission of the final report. We think this work will automatically or by default be improved by a lot of the work that Implementation Operations is doing on reporting on recommendations.

We also want to target the time for Board action to be less than six months. And lastly, we want to target a 100% approval rate by the Board once they receive a recommendation. We believe both of these can actually be achieved by having fewer more focused recommendations that are clear, implementable, and have clear community support.

So how do we do it? A lot said. So, essentially, we have three main buckets on how we plan on addressing this. The first is to redesign the process for setting the scope of a review and review planning. So setting the scope of a review during pre-planning would enable greater Community, Board, and Org alignment on the review’s focus areas, so exactly what a review is looking at. It would also better inform resource planning in terms of what external consultants would be required based on the focus areas, what the required skillsets for

review volunteers would be, and that would really make the schedule for review activities more predictable and more efficient for the entire ICANN ecosystem.

The second bucket is to develop a standardized process for research, problem/opportunity identification, and recommendation development. The standardization of this process would allow for more methodical research and the transparent development of research findings, problems and opportunities and recommendations. Standardizing this process would also build on the strong foundation of planning from the previous improvement, creating a predictable process that allows for the participation of qualified consultants and ICANN SMEs at key junctures within that process.

The third bucket is to develop processes and tools that enable more robust review monitoring and community engagement to bring greater accountability and transparency to the review process. This will ensure that the community is continuously in the loop on review efforts and will create more clear and direct means for soliciting community input during Public Comment proceedings.

If following the initial draft proceedings, it's clear that there's a lack of understanding or the initial recommendations differ drastically from the previous draft recommendations, then a supplemental public comment proceeding would be required. We view these elements as really helping get community alignment on issues so that when they reach Board consideration, there's a much clearer understanding of community support for the recommendations.

Lastly, to implement a continuous improvement effort to facilitate ongoing improvements through the reviews process with a focus on effectiveness and efficiency. So we're not just talking about collecting lessons learned. We're talking about actively creating plans to ensure that there's impactful change based off of issues that were identified during the conduction of review.

If we look at a roadmap for this work, we do anticipate a publication of proposed redesigned processes. It's sometime in April. So this is essentially a second thought paper on the direction and the areas I just identified, a little bit more detail and granularity into these areas. We anticipate having community engagement and in consultation thereafter, May through July, to inform the community to share this information, to have active conversations.

We expect to have the proposed revision for the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews drafted by August for internal consideration and discussion. And we're aiming to have a Public Comment proceeding on the revised Operating Standards in November of this year. This would really help us have these discussions actively ideally at the next general ICANN meeting. It's really to ensure we have complete alignment on this and we can proceed confidently.

I do see Xavier's hand is up. Xavier, please.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Jason. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. If you're finished, I can make my comment.

JASON KEAN:

Nope. Perfect time.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. I just wanted to put a little bit in context this timeline that we're offering here. The team is eager to be able to support a process that is efficient on this project to improve reviews. But obviously, the timing of completion is second to a collective agreement on what we should do moving forward. So the only thing I'm saying with that is simply that we would like to be able to operate within this timing, but community consensus on how we should evolve reviews as a result of this process is paramount. And if it takes more time, then it will need more time. So this is a desirable plan that's not yet taking into account fully workload of the community through those timings. So it may need to be adjusted. But also, as an ecosystem, we need to give ourselves the opportunity to bring this to a position where everyone is able to accept the recommendations for improvements. Timing cannot be the driving factor, consensus is. So it will take the time that it will take, not that we want to take forever about it, because this is not going to work. But there's nothing more important than a collective agreement. Otherwise, nothing will ever succeed.

So I just wanted to put that in context because we want to get this done as effectively as possible so that it also takes as little time as possible for everyone, particularly the community volunteers that it will need to take the time that it will need. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

JASON KEAN: Thank you, Xavier. I appreciate it. Before I provide any additional context, I do see hands raised. So perhaps some of that can be given through responding to questions asked, so I'll go straight to questions. Yvette, please.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. We did have one question in the Q&A pod. And then I saw Sébastien's hand up. So I'm going to go in the order of receipt. So we have Jim Prendergast. "For those recommendations that went into the Pending category, do you have measurements of how long items spent as pending?"

JASON KEAN: That is a great question. I will actually defer to my Implementation Operation colleagues on that. Sorry to put you on the spot. But Alice or Giovanni, do you know?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Hi, Jason, thank you. Jim, thank you for the question. Just to clarify a bit because, indeed, at the time, the Board goes through the final report with all the recommendations coming from the different review teams, there might be some recommendations that are placed into the Pending category because there are dependencies or because they deserve further investigation by ICANN to determine how they should be implemented. At present, we have five recommendations coming from the last iterations of the four Specific Reviews that are still in the

Pending category, which we aim to sort out by this year at the latest. Again, those were placed in the Pending category because there was some work pending or dependencies. I don't know if my answer is answering your question, or if you needed more specific information on the pending recommendations.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes. Thanks, Giovanni. I was just trying to get a sense of when the Board makes an additional determination, this is going to be pending, how long is it taking to clear that backlog, so to speak?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: That's a very good question, Jim. And thank you again for asking it. Usually, we are trying to sort out pending recommendations as soon as possible. Sometimes there are big dependencies like dependencies on programs and initiatives that are not developed yet, and that may put a recommendation in the Pending status, but we have been catching up quite well on pending recommendations. And the plan which is also part of the Lifecycle of Reviews Project is to avoid similar situation in the future. So at the end of any Specific Review, any review in the future, there should be recommendations that are there, and they're able to be implemented in a timely manner.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Then on to the next one. Sébastien, I see you have your hand up. Please unmute and ask your question.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I will be the bad participant. But when you take this proposal, it seems that there was no evolution on the reviews done, all the reviews. But in fact, ATRT3 we're working under another way of doing the review, it's why they were only five recommendations compared to hundreds from the previous or the other reviews. It's a little bit strange that we are already pushing for something else, we just would apply for one review. But we can always evolve. I like the idea of continuous improvement for that, too, and not this big project with one year or more time to do it.

My other point is that we in ATRT3, for purposes of how to engage the community, we suggest to pause or to withdraw some of the Specific Reviews. It seems that I tried to find the translation in English. Nature evolves in vacuum. We seem to need something. But I'm not sure that it's the more important to be done now. We need to do the Pilot Holistic Review, and it could be maybe once again too late. We are pushing for dates, three years, four years between the proposal and the implementation. It's a long time. Maybe that's the first things we need to fix and not to spend time to review the review was not really be done except for ATRT3. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Thank you, Sébastien. I do not have any more questions in the Q&A pod. I'm just making sure I'm looking at the participation thing. I do not see any hands up.

JASON KEAN:

Okay, great. Thank you, Yvette. And thank you for your statement, Sébastien, and the questions. As Xavier noted, engaging with the community on more granular information is coming down the pike. So we are really looking forward to engaging with everybody, sharing this information, providing greater context in a form dedicated to this topic. So we are welcoming everyone's participation in that process.

At this point, I would actually like to end the session from RSA and hand it over to the Implementation Operations Team to start the second half of this webinar. I apologize. Actually, before I do that, Evin, would you please give opportunities for additional community participation?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Sure. I'll be very quick because I know we're running a few minutes behind on time, but just you see on the screen here, Opportunities for Community Participation and Input. As mentioned, we have the ongoing work of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group, and they will be having a session during ICANN79 on Wednesday, the 6th of March. There will also be a dedicated session to the ATRT4 deferral and timing during ICANN79. That's on Tuesday, the 5th of March. And we're always welcoming any engagement sessions with your community or stakeholder group on the ICANN Reviews Program, so please feel free to reach out to us. I think I'm turning it over to Alice now from Implementation Operations. Thank you.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you so much, Evin. Hi, everyone. My name is Alice Jansen, and I'm a director working with Giovanni Seppia in the Implementation Operations department. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So our department is part of the CFO, Xavier Calvez's office, and was created to bring structure to how ICANN addresses implementation of non-policy recommendations. In other words, output from reviews and cross-community working groups. So today, I will take you on a journey through the implementation status of Specific Reviews recommendations. And then Alperen Eken, who is a member of the Policy Development department, will join me in sharing an update on the Work Stream 2 implementation.

So to kick us off, I would like to show a snapshot of how the 135 recommendations that emerged on the most recent Specific Reviews efforts were processed. So we have a total of 71 recommendations which the Board approved, subject to prioritization, and which are now in the implementation phase. So we've received priority labels from the community on practically all of the recommendations, and that serves to inform our implementation planning.

As Giovanni just indicated, there's still a set of five pending recommendations which we continue to gather information needed to move these to Board consideration. In comparison, however, almost a year ago, we had 20 recommendations in that pending box. There were two Board actions that took place in September and December of 2023. Some of which were tied to DNS abuse, as Xavier also indicated in the chat. I would ask my colleagues if they could insert the links to these two Board actions in the chat for you to read if you're

interested in reading more about this. So now let's take a look at how we're doing in implementing the 71 Board-approved recommendations. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So this slide here offers an overview of progress over the count of quarters since prioritization first took place. We have February 2024 as a data point here, as a lot of progress has happened since the year 2024 started. Specifically, I'm pleased to report that we've recently moved eight additional recommendations to complete, and five out of the Not Started box since a year started. So this translates into 53% of the recommendations being Complete for all four reviews, 44% In Progress, and only 3% in the Not Started status. In comparison, almost a year ago, we had 40% in Complete and 16% in the Not Started. So now let's take a closer look at what these numbers mean. Next slide please.

Okay. So across the four reviews, we currently have a set of 38 recommendations marked Complete, 31 In Progress, and 2 in Not Started. Looking at the Complete box first, the green box, I'm going to share some highlights with you in the interest of time. And Giovanni will also include some links within the chat box if you're interested in reading more about these efforts as well.

So in January, we released the final process for retiring non-policy recommendations, for which we had a community consultation. With the release of that process, as well as with the prioritization having been effectively integrated into ICANN's planning cycles, ATRT3 Recommendation 5 was moved to Complete. We've also moved the work on the ATRT3 Recommendation 2 to completion with the release

of ICANN Org's follow-ups on ATRT3's assessment of past implementation work. So ATRT2 implementation, essentially.

We've also recently marked RDS-WHOIS2 Recommendations 10.1, 12.1 as Complete, as the topics of these recommendations were included into plans for RDS3, if and when convened. As Jason indicated earlier, there's a dependency on ATRT4 for this particular work. The RDS-WHOIS2 SG.1 was also moved to Complete and has been added to the queue of items for contracted parties' consideration.

In the SSR2 sphere, the two recommendations that relate to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Cybersecurity framework and are also in the green. We also have the Recommendation 5.3, which was moved to Complete through the addition of a security standards related clause to applicable contracts with external service provider parties.

So overall, 6 of the 15 ATRT3 recommendations are complete, 5 of the 17 recommendations for CCT are complete, 11 of 15 for RDS are complete, and 16 of the 24 SSRS2 are complete. Recommendation that you see with a [hyperlink here](#) have implementation documentation attached to them.

So implementation documentation, for those who are new to this process, is a fundamental part of what we do, as it provides evidence of the implementation work, but also context for how a recommendation was operationalized and what led to that thinking and rationale for building the implementation the way we built it. So it really is important for the accounting and transparency purpose of the

process, and so on. But also the objective of this implementation documentation is to help inform the subsequent review efforts when it comes to assessing past implementation work. All right, so now let's move to the In Progress and Not Started recommendations. Next slide, please.

So we currently have 31 recommendations in progress. The nine remaining ATRT3 recommendations are all in progress. And you've just received some updates on some of the work that's going towards addressing those. We also have 12 CCT recommendations in progress, some of which were sliced into various components and mapped out to fit under some broader data collection umbrellas. Six of the 24 SSR2 recommendations are in progress. We do have two recommendations in not started. But these are dependent on condition of another recommendation. So there's a thread here to follow.

With respect to RDS-WHOIS2, the four remaining recognitions are in progress. But actually, with the release of the Registration Data Policy for gTLDs that happened yesterday, implementation of CC.2 is considered complete. But we still need to run our due diligence first to ensure that we've addressed all of the components without recommendation before we can move it to Complete. This part of what we do in Implementation Operations.

So we have some Progress Reports on Implementation, as well as on the status of pending recs, which go out on a quarterly basis. They really are a great resource if you're interested in learning more about the strategy, plans, estimated completion dates, and so on. And in addition to that, we have some wiki and Org pages as well, which are a

great way for you to keep a finger on the pulse of progress. I believe all of the links are in the slides for you to see in the appendices. But I'm happy to post any of those in the chat if helpful.

Before we go to the Q&A on this, I do want to emphasize that this really continues to be a priority for the Org and its CEO goals as well for the Fiscal Year 2024. Rest assured that we are doing all we can to make sure these get addressed as soon as feasible, and that pending recs are addressed appropriately, going to your question, Jim. Let me turn this now to Yvette for the Q&A on Specific Reviews. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay. Thank you, Alice. Any questions? I do not see any in the Q&A pod at the moment, and I do not see any hands raised. I'm going to give it a moment because I do not want to miss anyone. No, at this point, we do not have any questions.

ALICE JANSEN:

Okay, great. Let's go to Work Stream 2 land. Thank you. Next slide, please.

So I'm going to start with a brief introduction of what Work Stream 2 is. So this process actually goes back to the IANA Stewardship Transition, enhancing ICANN accountability process was developed essentially to provide assurance that ICANN would remain accountable in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the U.S. government. And that work was divided into two phases. We had the first work stream which focused on accountability

mechanisms and improvements essential for the transition. And then you had the second work stream which focused on topics for which implementation was not required for the success of the transition.

So that work was conducted by a Cross-Community Working Group. The final report was released in 2018. The Board adopted all the consensus recommendation in 2019. That essentially entails a set of 65 recommendations for the organization to implement, but also 37 recommendations for the community groups to address, as applicable. They cover a wide set of topics, as you will see in the in the next slide, focusing on the Org implementation first. If we could switch to the next slide. Thank you.

So this graph here shows you the progress that has happened over time. Currently, 77% of the recommendations are Complete, 20% In Progress, and 3 in Not Started. And in comparison almost a year ago, we had 60% of the recommendations labeled as Complete. So again, I'm using the February data point here, as we have some fresh progress to report on. Next slide, please.

So, of the 65 recommendations in our portfolio, we currently have 15 left to complete, 13 of which are in progress, and 2 which are tied to dependencies. All of the other ones are complete and have some implementation documentation that you are most welcome to click on, if you're interested in seeing the results of that implementation work.

Recent highlights include the release of the diversity toolkit that serves to support the community groups in their implementation work for diversity. I'm sure Giovanni will post a link for you in the chat.

Also, we have the repository for the documented practices, policies, and procedures of community groups that was put together and posted on the Policy page of the ICANN website to address one of the recommendations here.

There was a new language that was recently added to the Agreements and Policies page on the ICANN Org website to address one of the jurisdiction-related recommendations.

So a lot of happening here. And rest assured that we are continuing the work here to address the 15 remaining recommendations, including unlocking those two recommendations that are tied to a dependency here.

We also post implementation documentation pieces, as I indicated, and we have our quarterly reports as well for these in which you will find useful information such as next steps to complete the remaining recommendations, completion timeframes, and so on. The quarterly updates also address the community implementation, which, as indicated, is a big portion of this project as well. And beyond these reports, we also have the typical, the usual wiki and Org pages, which are great tools as well to keep apprised of the work going into this.

I will now leave the microphone to my friend and colleague, Alp, who walk you through the community Work Stream 2 implementation journey. Alp, the floor is yours. Thank you.

ALPEREN EKEN:

Thank you so much, Alice. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I am Alp, as Alice said, I work with the Policy team. I will go over the community implementation of Work Stream 2 as part of the Work Stream 2 implementation. Many thanks to the Implementation Operations Team for the opportunity here.

In this slide, you can see a summary of the community implementation. As you can see, 28 recommendations are in progress, and 9 recommendations are completed. All completed recommendations are from Recommendation 6. As Alice said before, you can see the implementation documentation links. During the last Prep Week, before the Hamburg meeting, we still had three recommendations in the Not Started bucket, they moved to the In Progress bucket. They were Diversity recommendations. In the following slides, I will give you more information regarding the community efforts in implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations. Next slide, please.

You can see eight groups of recommendations here. Only part of them was directed to community. These are the bright ones in the graphic. I think it is indicative. Among them, we have recommendations that are to be implemented by individual groups only. I will cover them in the following slide. The rest of time requires certain coordination among groups. That's why two years ago, we formed the Work Stream 2 CCG which has Work Stream 2 Committee Coordination Groups. I see many participants of this group are already in this webinar.

For Recommendation 1, diversity recommendations, we produced two outcome documents regarding 1.1 and 1.7. And for 1.6, community helped Org in creation of the diversity toolkit that Alice just mentioned. And Giovanni put the link in the chat.

For Recommendation 2.3, the group paused to work in order to wait for Empowered Community participating groups which are all SOs and ACs, except RSSAC and SSAC, to complete the implementation of 2.1 and 2.2.

For Recommendation 3.1, the groups shared their point of view, the work data to date, and complete necessary steps to share information among themselves. The information was shared in a wiki page that Org manages, which is available on the community wiki. We can go to the next slide, please.

So, this slide shows the status of individual community groups' implementation. Every single community group and their respective structures works on the repository that we created, you can see the current state here. Currently, as you can see, all diversity recommendations are in progress. As I mentioned, two slides before, they were in the Not Started bucket, now they're In Progress. It is on the three recommendations, but it applies to relevant groups. So it means that we have to follow the implementation of 63 recommendations in 21 groups.

Currently, all diversity recommendations are in progress, as I said, but it is not the same for the other recommendations. So as you can see, Empowered Community related to the recommendations are

complete more than 50%. Similarly, accountability recommendations, transparency, participation, outreach, and policy and procedures recommendations that are under the buckets of Recommendation 6, they are mostly done.

So to add a note, we are only marking a certain recommendation Complete if all relevant groups mark them Complete. So this requires a certain amount of coordination and sharing good practice among groups. So if one stakeholder group completes a recommendation and thinks that it is enough as an implementation, we are sharing that information with other groups so that they can see what is happening over there and they can complete their own recommendations.

So this is all from my side. Thank you for listening, everyone. Over to you, Alice for the Q&A section, I guess.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thanks, Alp. I'm actually going to turn this to Yvette for Questions and Answers. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Thank you, Alice. Okay, looking at the Q&A pod, I don't see any questions in the Q&A pod. I'm checking. I don't see any hands up either. Just making sure I don't miss—

ALICE JANSEN:

Yvette, there's a question from Anne for Alp on the slide 40.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: You said on slide 40. Okay.

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes, exactly. So the recommendations that are marked with an asterisk, they are shared between the Org and the community. So as the Org, we have to help community groups to implement recommendations, but we have certain amounts of work that Org needs complete. The human rights framework, regarding that specific recommendation, the Recommendation 3.1, that recommendation, as I said, requires a certain amount of coordination among community groups. We worked within Work Stream 2 CCG, so that each group shares their parts what they are doing regarding human rights within their own structures. And you can see relevant information in the wiki page that I will post here in the chat, Anne.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. All right, thank you, Alp. We do have one question that just popped up in the Q&A pod. What is the status of the recommendation on jurisdiction?

ALICE JANSEN: Thanks very much, Yvette. So we have four recommendations in jurisdiction. There's one remaining, one that—sorry, five recommendations—there's one that remains in progress for now. I believe the estimated completion for the remaining one is this quarter here. So we should complete the whole jurisdiction section by the end of this calendar quarter.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Thank you, Alice. That was by Finn Petersen. Any other questions? I don't see anything else in the Q&A pod and I don't see anything else in the participation. Going once, going twice. Okay. No more questions. I will hand it over to Giovanni for final remarks. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Yvette. And thanks, everybody, for attending this very interesting session with a lot of updates on reviews, where we stand, what's in the pipeline, with anticipation of really the work that we have ahead of us. And as Xavier mentioned earlier, this is a work that we are doing together, and together we'll move it forward even in a more timely manner.

With that said, this presentation, which is available, contains an appendix with review resources and other information. There are good sessions coming up regarding Specific Review Recommendations at ICANN79, which Evin has mentioned. And with that, I'd like to thank Jason, Evin, Alice, Alp, and Katrina for being a speaker, Xavier for participating in this interesting session. I also like to thank Yvette, Sara, and Madeleine for the support behind the scene and all those work behind the scenes to prepare the session, as well as, most importantly, the interpreters. Apology if we have gone too fast at some point. Thank you so much to Maria and all the team of interpreters that is supporting this session.

With that said, we will continue to keep you updated. There are plenty of pages on ICANN Org and also on the community wiki where you can find nearly live updates on what we have been speaking about. And with that, thank you, everybody. See you, probably many of you, at ICANN79 or online during other sessions. Thanks a lot. I'm drawing this session to close. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]