
ICANN80 | Prep Week – ICANN Reviews Update
Thursday, May 30, 2024 – 08:00 to 09:30 PM KGL

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN Prep Week reviews update on Thursday, May 30th at 1800 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux and Madeleine Werbelow 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 this 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 on the record. If you have a comment or question you would like addressed during the Q&A portions of each presentation, please feel free to raise your hand or to do the noted formats that we'll be posting in the chat. You can actually just post things in the Q&A pod. That's the place to go to post questions and answers. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, and Portuguese. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you would like to 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, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. This session

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.

includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. And to view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. And to ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name.

Okay, that does it for me. So with that, I will hand the floor over to our Vice President of Reviews, Operations, and Accountability, Larisa Gurnick. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Yvette. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I'm Larisa Gurnick, and I am very pleased to welcome you to the Prep Week session on ICANN Reviews. Reviews are conducted to assess how certain aspects of the ICANN ecosystem are performing, including how the ICANN organization, board, and community fulfill commitments to global stakeholders. ICANN Reviews include reviews of the ICANN structures known as organizational reviews, which are conducted by independent examiners, and also, reviews of various commitments that stemmed from the affirmation of commitments and are now known as specific reviews.

These reviews are conducted by members of the ICANN community. Each review is a multistakeholder effort in which the community or the independent examiners make recommendations. The board considers these recommendations, and the org implements those recommendations that are adopted by the board. Reviews are an

important aspect of the ICANN checks and balances. Let's turn to slide four, please, the agenda slide.

As you can see on this agenda, we will cover three areas, the status of various ICANN Reviews, the status of implementation of specific review recommendations, and as well, the status of implementation of recommendations from Work Stream 2 of enhancing ICANN accountability.

I'd like to highlight several important recent developments. On the 29th of April, the ICANN Board approved two actions related to ICANN Reviews, the initiation of the pilot holistic review, and the deferral of the fourth accountability and transparency review that we refer to as ATRT4. Both decisions are important steps in the board's commitment to implement community-issued specific review recommendations, and they're a part of the board's oversight, responsibility over specific reviews, including ATRT4.

A great deal of work happened to bring us to this stage of the pilot holistic review including community prioritization of review recommendations, collaborative work of community, board, and org to develop terms of reference that have support of the ICANN community, and the call for volunteers to serve on the pilot holistic review. This was just announced last week, and we're looking forward to the SOs and ACs assembling a qualified and diverse review team to start the work in September. We're delighted to see several community members already expressing their interest to serve, and the application window will remain open until the 19th of June.

The limited time deferral of the fourth accountability and transparency review will allow for that review to take place when there is support and involvement of the ICANN community to ensure it can be carried out as thoroughly, effectively, and efficiently as possible. The community coordination group on continuous improvement is also making steady progress. This work is important because it provides flexibility to the ICANN community to implement improvements that are relevant to their supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Ultimately, the community will agree on the continuous improvement framework and begin their assessments to identify, prioritize, and implement meaningful improvements. ICANN Board will check in on the status of that work by June of 2025, just about a year from now, in order to determine what to do about the deferred organizational reviews. Ideally, with sufficient progress and clear path forward, organizational reviews will be replaced by the continuous improvement program as recommended by the third accountability and transparency review.

This is all part of work effort to improve reviews, and you will hear about other aspects of that work. The Life Cycle of Reviews Project is an effort to improve the process of specific reviews. This work is in response to challenges identified by the community board and org over the course of numerous review cycles. The goal is to introduce improvements following project management best practices, decrease the resources in a time that specific reviews take, and increase the effectiveness of specific reviews and the positive impact they have to benefit the multi-stakeholder community.

Our colleagues from the implementation operations team will go over the progress made on the implementation of recommendations. So as you can see, we have a full agenda. We will pause for questions throughout the presentation, and we welcome your questions at that time. And now, I'd like to introduce you to the presenters and their teams. Next slide, please.

So here you can see our Executive Vice President, Xavier Calvez, and his team, including Giovanni. Alice, who will be presenting as well as presenting from the policy development team is Ab. And you will be hearing from them later in the presentation. Next slide, please.

From the GDS team under the leadership of Theresa Swinehart, you will hear from the review support and accountability team, and specifically presenting will be Evin and Jason. And now, I will pass this on to Jason for an update on the status of ICANN Reviews. Thank you.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you, Larisa. Next slide, please.

So as Larisa noted, I'm going to kick-off the first portion of this webinar discussing ICANN Reviews updates as part of the review support and accountability team. Next slide, please.

So to start, I'm going to provide a little bit more detail to the Larisa's overview. So the ICANN Reviews program consists of two ICANN bylaws and mandated reviews. Reviews, as Larisa noted, conducted by external examiners and specific reviews conducted by community-led review teams. I'd like to call out the little construction sign you see

above specific reviews. As Larisa noted, the Life Cycle of Reviews Project, currently underway by ICANN org is looking at ways to improve the efficiencies and effectiveness of the way reviews are run. And in doing so introduce some process improvements, which I will provide an update on a little bit later.

Specific reviews currently consist of four reviews. The first being accountability transparency review, ATRT, competition consumer trust and consumer choice review, CCT, registration directory service review, RDS, and security stability and resiliency review, SSR. And we see another construction sign in the upper right-hand corner. This stemming from ATRT is signifying a couple of recommendations that came out of ATRT3 to improve the reviews process.

If we follow the dotted line, it leads to the recommendation for a holistic review, which Larisa just touched on some updates and we'll discuss in further detail. And also, the Continuous Improvement Program, which is an effort to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. Next slide, please.

Thank you. Now a quick update on the status of ICANN reviews. So I just mentioned most of these, so it's where these are currently at. So the registration directory service review as well as the security stability and resiliency review have currently been deferred secondary to an ATRT3 recommendation. Their timing will be determined by ATRT4. The competition consumer trust and consumer choice review too has not yet been started either and will start after the conclusion of the next round. The accountability and transparency 4, ATRT4 has been deferred and will be initiated no later than April of 2025.

And lastly, the holistic review, the new specific review has not yet been started. And its timing will actually be determined following the conclusion of the pilot holistic review's work and the board consideration. A quick note on the schedule for this. The pilot holistic review's work will start in September 2024 and conclude November 2025. And as you can note for organizational reviews, all of them have been deferred. The board will reevaluate these reviews in June of 2025 based on progress involving the evolution of organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. Next slide, please.

So I just mentioned a lot of these reviews have been deferred. That does not mean there is not a large amount of review related work going on. So some of these efforts I just noted, the continuous improvement program, developing a framework for this is currently underway. This is requiring quite a bit of community involvement with ICANN org support. The pilot holistic review, as Larisa noted, planning is well underway for a start in September. And there's also an effort underway for the Life Cycle Reviews Program to introduce some process improvements prior to the initiation of another specific review. And on here, I'd just like to note, ATRT4 is also included as well as organizational reviews. That check-in point I just mentioned. Next slide, please.

Now moving on to one of the big recommendations that we're currently working on, and that is recommendation 3 from ATRT3, the holistic review. So a quick history I mentioned. ATRT3 is part of bylaws mandated review. ATRT3 examined specifically how reviews function, hence a lot of the recommendations that I mentioned previously. ATRT3

developed recommendation 3.5 calling for this specific review. So the board approved this recommendation with a few caveats. Next slide, please.

So the biggest caveat is that the holistic review be initiated first as a pilot. Subject to community prioritization, which Larisa noted was another ATRT3 recommendation that required the development of framework and available resources and also, operated pursuant to a community-agreed terms of reference. After those caveats are met, a pilot holistic review would then operationalize a holistic review and address board identified concerns. And just to wrap this up quickly, that community-agreed terms of reference consisted over two years of work and two public comment proceedings. And we're happy now to be on the other end of that and moving forward with the initiated review. Next slide, please.

So as Larisa noted, the board took action on this in their decision on the 29th of April. So part of their decision included a couple of resolutions, and I'm just going to go through them now. So preparations begin immediately to initiate the review as soon as feasible, no later than September 2024. The pilot holistic review shall be carried out based on the pilot holistic review terms of reference and following and operating standards for specific reviews that has been modified to be applicable to the pilot holistic review. The board also directed ICANN org's interim president and CEO or her designees to develop project plans to facilitate the completion of this review within 14 months of this commencement. And there's a couple more. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So the board acknowledged that the pilot holistic review terms of reference had been updated to incorporate clarifications and board expectations developed by the board's OEC to provide guidelines to the pilot holistic review team. The context here is following the second public comment proceeding, there were a few outstanding concerns from the community that acquired addressment and the OEC proactively took action to address those in the latest updated version of the pilot holistic review terms of reference. And lastly, the board directs the pilot holistic review team to follow the updated terms of reference and the operating standards for specific reviews as modified to be applicable to the pilot holistic review. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So a timeline for where we're at and where we're going with this pilot holistic review. So as Larisa noted, the call for volunteers is open. It opened on the 23rd of May and will close on the 19th of June. The review selection process will start on the 20th of June and go through the 2nd of August. And the review team announcement will happen on the 13th of September. We're shooting for the review team to be convened on the 25th of September to officially start their work and the 14-month period will begin at that point. We do have a couple of milestones in here that we're projecting forward. That being a public comment on a draft report sometime in April 2025 and the final report being published and delivered to the board around November 2025 with board consideration following. Next slide, please.

So again, to harp on this, the application period to serve on this review team is open. We really encourage anybody that's interested in serving on this team to read the team member role description for additional

information. This includes desired attributes, responsibilities, work methodology and the selection process itself. We do have a link in there as well as on the wiki to the application form. And again, applications are due on the 19th of June. And I believe we have a link. If we could drop that link in one more time for the call for volunteers announcement, that would be great in the chat. Thank you very much. And next slide, please.

So I'll stop at this point. I covered the reviews program and the pilot holistic review up to the current status and looking forward. So we'll pause here to see if anyone has any questions about any of the material we just covered.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Thank you, Jason. Yes, we do have one question so far. One from Aubrey. I'll go ahead and read it aloud on the record. This is from Avri Doria. What chance, given that people will be busy in April 2025, that ATRT4 will be pushed off yet again. At what point does postponement of the critical oversight review, oversight of the board and staff organization themselves become a bylaws level crisis?

JASON KEAN:

Thank you for that question, Avri. So I would like to say that leading up to the decision point in April 2025, ICANN org will be presenting the OEC and the board with information on the current status of ATRT3 recommended recommendations for their implementation to inform that decision. And it's going to continue to be a community led decision,

just like the consultation period that happened previously. So that decision point is going to be driven on all the current status, but also, the board's perception of what's going on. I believe we are preparing, though, that it will initiate at April—no later than 2025. So I'll stop there and see if any of my other colleagues have anything to add on that.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Jason. This is Larisa Gurnick. Just to emphasize that from our perspective, all work is underway to conclude the implementation of ATRT3 recommendations and to initiate ATRT4 no later than April 2025. Thank you.

JASON KEAN:

Great. Thank you. And just a note, we will cover that board resolution following the next portion of this webinar. Okay. Yvette, are there any other questions?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay. At this point, I don't see any in the Q&A pod. I'm just double checking to make sure I didn't miss anybody's hand up. I don't see anybody's hand. No, sir. I don't see any other questions.

JASON KEAN:

Great. Then, without further ado, I'll hand it over to my colleague, Evin, for the Continuous Improvement Program. Evin, please.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Jason. Great. Hello, everyone. Evin Erdogan speaking. So I'll provide an update on the progress of evolving Organizational Reviews into a Continuous Improvement Program. For context, the Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team issued two recommendations to address issues related to the function of reviews. The issue observed by many community members over the years is that organizational reviews conducted by independent examiners are time consuming and costly, and on the most part, do not produce useful recommendations and outcomes. ATRT3 published these recommendations to address these community concerns. Next slide, please.

Thank you. ATRT3 Recommendation 3.6 called for the evolution of Organizational Reviews conducted by independent examiners into a Continuous Improvement Program led by the ICANN community. One of the goals for the program is to accomplish the objectives of Organizational Reviews without undertaking the volume of work required in the past. The ICANN community demonstrated great interest in this work, with 21 out of 22 of the groups across the ICANN community represented in a Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group, which convened in January this year.

The group is tasked with developing a framework for the Continuous Improvement Program, which will be published for public comment prior to adoption by each supporting organization, advisory committee, and the NomCom. The continuous improvement program will eventually include a regular survey of members and participants for assessment utilizing the community developed framework. The board

will consider the progress made on this work, including the framework for adoption by June 2025. Next slide, please.

Thank you. The community volunteers have shared the extensive work already underway within all the structures towards continuous improvement and are collaborating on community-wide implementation of this recommendation. In work to date, the group has considered a range of methodologies for effective continuous improvement programs utilizing a principles criteria indicators framework fit for ICANN purpose. The principles of the framework described the objectives of the continuous improvement program. They define what the program is fundamentally trying to do, and they come from the current ICANN bylaws pertaining to organizational review objectives.

Criteria are the conditions that need to be met in order to comply with the principle. Criteria define how a principle will be achieved without themselves being a measure of performance. Indicators define what the program will measure to assess whether or not criteria are being met, and indicators can include metrics and other processes put in place to meet criteria. A common base for the community assessment is provided by having shared principles. Each group has the flexibility to prioritize the criteria that they determine to be most relevant and impactful to improve how their organization functions.

The Community Coordination Group is drafting this framework while relaying information back to their groups to inform the process. The group is about six months into their collective work to develop this framework. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So this slide shows more details about the work of the Community Coordination Group this year within the overall Continuous Improvement Program roadmap. Their work has been divided into four phases over 2024. The target for the opening of the public comment will be soon after ICANN81 at the end of November, and the community coordination group will be available to address input on the framework as needed. Where possible, this timeline is to be expedited by the Community Coordination Group, but it's anticipated to take at least the calendar year 2024 based on the current cadence of the community's work.

Those in the community who are interested in this work are encouraged to reach out to your community groups representative to learn more. Please see the list of Community Coordination Group members on the workspace of which I'll share a link to in the chat now. There we go. Next slide, please.

Thank you. Okay, there we go. So in terms of next steps, after the development of the framework, on this slide is the overall roadmap for the Continuous Improvement Program. After the public comment proceeding, the first Continuous Improvement Program assessment period would take place. The work of the Community Coordination Group to produce a framework for the program will be done by then, but the overall implementation of ATRT3 recommendation 3.6 will continue under the first assessment.

As envisioned by ATRT3, the assessment is estimated to last three years, including a survey of each organizational structure and their stakeholders utilizing this community developed framework. The

results of the assessments will inform the holistic review and both the continuous improvement program and holistic review are subject to community support, board approval and incorporation into the ICANN bylaws. The implementation of this recommendation is an opportunity to replace Organizational Reviews with a more flexible process that is responsive to the unique needs of the ICANN community structures and their constituent parts while maintaining consistency and comparability across all structures.

It's also an opportunity to support meaningful improvements within the ICANN community, including toward improved governance. So we're excited to support the community in this significant effort. Next slide, please.

Great. Thank you. So with that, I'll pause here to take any questions. Yvette, if you would please let me know if there's anything already in the chat or Zoom room, that would be appreciated. Thanks.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay, Evin. We don't have anything in the Q&A pod. We have a lot going on in the chat. We have a lot of chatting going on in the chat. I'm rolling through there to try to see if there's anything in there. We did have some comments going on. We did have one question from Avri asking to define what is AGB, but I'm not sure if that's in relation to that.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Oh, maybe it was AGM?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Not what? Oh, thank you, Giovanni. It's when is AGB, my bad. Thank you. Mine came out as AGB. So maybe she meant AGM.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. Yeah, I think it was AGM. The annual general meeting, I believe that's the first week.

AVRI DORIA: No. If I could jump in, I was asking about the AGB and the beginning of the application guidebook when we all went nuts over what was going to happen a year later. So sorry.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Thank you, Avri. Thank you for clarifying. Okay, I think we got that cleared up. I do not have anything in the Q&A pod, and I do not have any other questions, and I do not see any hands up. Going once going twice. No, I don't see any hands up. So we don't have any further questions. So we can continue on with the presentation.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Yvette. So I think I'm turning it back over to Jason now. Thanks.

JASON KEAN:

Great. Thank you, Evin. Appreciate it. So this has been a source of discussion in the chat. So we're going to talk about it a little bit more. So the timing of ATRT4. A little background on this, the board looking ahead at the schedule for ATRT4, which was scheduled for April 2024, discussed this back in September of 2023, and again in January of 2024. During which they asked ICANN org to initiate community consultation on the timing. ICANN org led this consultation effort, consulting with the supporting organizations and advisory committees on the timing and the potential deferral for a limited period of time. So SOs and ACs responded. Five SO and ACs responded individually and four constituencies responded from the GNSO prior to and to inform the board's decision. Next slide, please.

Apologies, Accountability and Transparency Review 4. So looking at the SO and AC responses, we had three of the responding SOs and ACs express support for deferral citing all the work associated with unimplemented ATRT3 recommendations and the capacity issues with running multiple reviews related projects in parallel. We additionally had two, which suggested responding ACs rather to proceed on schedule, citing adherence to the ICANN bylaws, and the role of the Accountability and Transparency Review that it plays in providing oversight in ICANN's core commitment. Next slide, please.

So the board took all of these responses and this consultation into consideration and had an action and board decision on the 29th of April. In the resolution, they decided to defer ATRT4 for a limited period of time, not to exceed 12 months to allow for progress of unimplemented

ATRT3 recommendations. Specifically, the Pilot Holistic Review and the Continuous Improvement Program. It was noted that both of these efforts require significant reviews related expertise in SOs and ACs, as well as specific work from ICANN org. Additionally, the board said that ICANN org should produce a status of implementation work on these recommendations in advance of their decision to initiate the Accountability and Transparency Review 4, which will happen no later than April of 2025. So again, this is the language directly from the board resolution. Next slide, please.

I believe, yes, this is the opportunity for anyone to ask any additional questions on that additional context that was just provided.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Yeah, I don't see any questions in the queue. One has just popped up. But before I read the question out loud, I'd just like to remind our speakers that we do have a request that we could just slow down our speaking pace so that our interpreters make sure that they can get interpretation done properly. Thank you, everyone. Okay, on to the question that's in the Q&A pod. This one is from Avri Doria, reading that on the record. What the bylaws approved process legitimizes use of public comment as a reason to delay—maybe it meant would. What the bylaws approved process legitimizes use of public comment as a reason to delay bylaws mandated ATRT reviews.

JASON KEAN:

I'm not quite certain on that. Avri, would you mind clarifying that?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: You can go ahead and unmute.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, what I'm asking is, what is the bylaws approved—the [inaudible]. It's what bylaws approved process legitimizes using public comment in this way to delay bylaws mandated ATRT reviews given their fundamental role in determining our legitimacy. We legitimize ourselves by being bottom up and having these bottom-up oversight reviews. ATRT being the critical lynchpin of this whole system. And I'm just wondering what bylaws approved process, a substantiated process, approves public comment as a good enough reason to move one of those bylaws mandated reviews. And that's the question. Thanks.

JASON KEAN: Appreciate that, Avri. And just one clarification, the consultation process was actually via correspondence to the SOs and ACs. And I did want to note as well, part of that conversation was, amongst all of the SOs and ACs to determine what they felt about the timing. So this was a community-led decision and this was a board directed action to start the consultation, and then a board action in response to the input they received from the SOs and ACs. So I can't speak to what governance element allows the board to do that. But I can just lay out exactly what that process was, and that the board did make the initial direction to do

that, and then responded to the information they did receive. And Larisa, please.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Jason. Just to follow up on Jason's comment, this process had been used before to ensure that community was prepared to participate fully in other specific reviews. So it was based on prior precedent. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. I do not see any more questions in the Q&A pod.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You got a hand up.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I see your hand now, Cheryl. Please, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Yvette. I wasn't concerned until Larisa just spoke, and now I am. Are we hearing, and perhaps I am not hearing correctly, that the use of some form of interactive correspondence, reading of blogs, getting in of comments, something that could be euphemistically termed public commentary from our ACs and our SOs, either their members [inaudible] large or their leadership, is a mechanism for not following bylaws, because I don't care about the precedents. That deeply

concerns me from a governance perspective. And I'm not suggesting you've got the answer, Larisa, but I'm bloody well keen to hear it from the board. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Thank you, Cheryl. Any other questions? I don't see any hands up. I don't see anything in the Q&A pod. Okay. So we will continue on with the presentation.

JASON KEAN:

Okay. Thank you for that, Cheryl, and thank you, Yvette. So moving on to the Lifecycle of Reviews Project, which we touched on earlier. A little bit of history here. ICANN has conducted eight specific reviews following the affirmation of commitments. The ICANN board had undertaken some work to improve specific reviews, but it actually paused this work while ATRT3 was active. And ICANN org initiated the Lifecycle of Reviews Project to continue the board's work and build on lessons learned over numerous cycles. Next slide, please.

Some specific reviews by the numbers. All this data has been collected from specific reviews fact sheets. So there's been about 10,000 hours spent by 62 community members in meetings, with about a 60 percent average participation rate by community volunteers. Generally, that's a really high participation rate by some, and a little bit of a lower rate by many others. Over 20,000 hours of ICANN org support has been delivered throughout this process. And this is just while the review was active, not preparing for an implementation thereafter. And \$3.4 million

US has been spent to support the work of the four specific review teams. Next slide, please.

We've noted an opportunity for improvement here. Of the board action taken on 130 recommendations, 31 percent were approved on the first pass within the required six months. Forty-three were placed into a pending category requiring additional clarity or a resolution of dependencies. Fourteen percent were rejected as not feasible, and 12 percent were directed to community groups outside of ICANN's remit to approve or reject. Next slide, please.

So some aspirational goals for future reviews. Targeting a duration of the review of less than 12 months. Time for the board action to act on the review recommendations less than six months. And board approval of the recommendations target of 100 percent. A really high rate, but we think if the right improvements are made throughout the process, all the information should be readily available for board approval along with community support. Next slide, please.

So some proposed improvement groupings based off of all this information and a lot of the work to date. And this is going back to a thought paper that we had published early in 2023 that we're continuing to build on. So the first is to redesign the process for setting scope review and review planning. Some examples of this, which we're already seeing come to fruition with the pilot holistic review is the ability to understand what the specific focus areas of review are and the ability for ICANN org to marshal the necessary resources. In the case of the pilot holistic review, that would be a technical writer or a business

writer, so that when the review team begins its work, they're fully staffed and equipped and ready to start work on day one.

Next, to develop a standardized process for research, problem and opportunity identification and recommendation development. Again, this is to best support the review team so that it has all the resources it needs and a methodology to kind of tap into and adapt as needed to produce quality recommendations in a very effective manner. Third, to develop the processes and tools and enable a more robust review monitoring and community engagement to bring greater accountability and transparency to the review process.

So here, we're talking about a couple of things. We're talking about really bolstering engagement throughout the review process so that SOs and ACs are very aware and tapped into the work of the review team in the direction it's going. And so, that community-wide, there's a clear understanding of the direction, what recommendations are, what possible adaptations to recommendations might be made based off of input received. So trying to better support that process. And lastly, to implement a continuous improvement effort to facilitate ongoing improvements to reviews. So essentially, how can we continue to make these improvements more nimbly along the way moving forward? Next slide, please.

Okay. So what are the next steps for the Lifecycle of Reviews? We're going to have a publication of a second thought paper. We're then going to have community engagement on proposed improvements. We're then going to look at drafting a revised operating standards for specific

reviews and then we're going to have a public comment proceeding on that revised operating standards draft. Next slide, please.

So when would this happen is the next slide. So looking forward, we're expecting to publish that second thought paper in June. We've already reached out with our policy colleagues to start scheduling dates to brief SOs and ACs on these proposed improvements to really understand what groups think of them, how we can align and get support moving forward so that there is complete transparency in this process and we're all in these improvements together.

Next, after we get all that input, we're actually going to start drafting that revised operating standards for specific reviews. It's going to be an iterative process, and we're really going to, again, use all that input to really inform what that is going to look like. And then in October, we're expecting to open a public comment proceeding on the revised draft terms of reference. Next slide, please.

So I provided an overview of the direction we're going, what the next steps are, and what the timeline is. At this point, we'd like to just pause for some questions.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay. And Sebastien Bachollet, I see your hand up, so please unmute and go ahead and ask your question.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I am in Geneva currently. Sebastien Bachollet speaking, sorry, with noise around me. Sorry for that. I first wanted to support the question raised by Avri and Cheryl in the previous part. I would like to give some comments on the last part of the presentation. First of all, when you compare 10,000 hours as a community member and 20 by staff, it's not fair because you compare apple and orange. You compare the time spent in a meeting by the community, but not the time spent on the work on the topic by the community.

Of course, when we participate to any working group, we do some work before, we do some work after. We need to do some consultation with other members of the community. Therefore, it's much more than the time you are putting in your slides. The second comment is that I don't know the percentage, but the percentage of recommendations are outside of ICANN. No, it's outside of ICANN staff limit, but not outside of ICANN. If this is done through the SO and AC to act, it's within ICANN, but outside of the hands of what you have to do as a staff.

If you can go back to the—I don't know if it's the previous or the one before slide, it will help me to remember what I wanted to say. Yeah. It seems that part of the community don't have time to do ATRT4, but we we're asking the community to do some work on a specific topic that could have been or must have been given to ATRT4 and not to start to work on. Therefore, here also, it's not fair to do that.

And to add one point, except ATRT3, we never went through the revised operating standard for specific reviews, therefore, why we want again to change it before to have it working? Once again, when we change the operating standard for a specific review, it was changed before ATRT3,

and it's the only time it was used. Therefore, once again, why to change it before we really go through with different reviews? Thank you.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you, Sebastien. I would like to note on the slide that you mentioned about the hours, those were not comparisons. Those were just showing how much time and effort everybody collectively puts forth in reviews. And just to note that we had to rely on the fact sheets as opposed to just guessing. Again, it's an aggregate of how much effort collectively goes into it. So by no means was that a comparison.

I wanted to note too, the operating standards for specific reviews are about the process, but it is about what gets done and how the review team and the board participated in it. And outside of that, there's a lot of preparations and facilitation that org does contribute to this process. And just as an example, the exercise we're going through at the pilot holistic review. What's happening this time differently is a lot of the effort, preparatory effort, is going in so that when the review team is convened, their resources and everything is ready for them to start their work on day one.

If we look at a 14-month timeline and they don't have to acquire additional third-party resources, scoping has pretty much helped them get to a place where they have specific focus areas. There's a lot of work that can actively be done day one through 14 months. So how we can facilitate community members coming together with a community agreement about specific topics and a direction of work is really what this is about. So I would like to emphasize that these are procedural

improvements to help out the review team that is convened to better support the review team so that these recommendations, once they reach board consideration, have a clearer path forward and more traction to get implemented more quickly. So, I'd just like to state that. I don't know if anybody else has any other comments in response to Sebastien, but I do appreciate your comment and your notes on this, Sebastien

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Sebastien, I see your hand up. Is that an old hand or do you have a follow up?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I'm on my phone and they're very noisy. Sorry not to put my hand out.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, so we can lower your hand, right? Okay, excellent. We've got that. Okay, I don't have any more questions. I don't have any more hands up and I do not have anything else in the Q&A pod. Going once, going twice. I think we're good. Okay. We can continue on with the presentation and we'll go back to the other slide.

JASON KEAN: And just to close this section out really quickly, as I hand it over to Evin, we are looking forward to having these conversations with everyone so we can really come to an understanding of what the effort is trying to

achieve and how we can work together collectively to achieve those outcomes. So thank you for that. Over to you, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Jason. And just to emphasize your point here, the community participation and contributions are critical for ICANN reviews to be effective. So we encourage you all to please plan for and participate in these opportunities here. As noted, there's the ongoing work of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group, and we encourage you to reach out to your group's representative for input. As Jason noted, the call for volunteers for the Pilot Holistic Review is now open through the 19th of June. The reviews team is also offering engagement sessions with the ICANN community during ICANN80 to provide the current status of the reviews program.

Lifecycle Reviews Engagement sessions are planned for July. The ICANN public comment on the draft revisions to the operating standards for specific reviews is estimated to open in October this year. And the ICANN public comment on the draft Continuous Improvement Program framework is estimated to open in November this year. And we also encourage you to please use this Prep Week webinar on ICANN Reviews as a resource, including this slide deck and recording once available. So this concludes the reviews team portion of this webinar, and I'd like to now hand it over to Giovanni Seppia, Vice President for Implementation Operations, for the next part of this webinar. Giovanni, over to you, please. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Evin. Indeed, this part is going to be presented by the Implementation Operations team that oversees the implementation of board approved recommendations from review teams and Cross Community Working Groups. This last part of today's session is divided into two. The first one is going to be an update on the specific reviews that, as our colleagues have explained, are anchored in the ICANN bylaws. And as my colleague Alice will tell you, there's been great progress over the past 12 months, with more than 15 percent of recommendations that have been complete against the number that was in June 2023.

The following part will be about the recommendations that came from Work Stream 2, which ended in 2018, and for which the board approved the recommendations in 2019. And in that case, there are just less than 20 percent of recommendations that are still to be complete. So there's been a lot of work to move things forward on the four specific review recommendations, as well as on the WS2 recommendations. So we can go to the next slide, please.

And this slide summarizes with an overview, the number of recommendations out of the four specific reviews, which were 135. And currently, we are having only five pending board consideration recommendations, which we are planning to move to board resolution in the coming months. With that said, and with no further ado, I'd like to leave the floor to my colleague, Alice, who is working in the Implementation Operations Department as Director, and is truly mastering and overseeing the different specific reviews and Work Stream 2 recommendations, including, for instance, the

recommendations that our colleague from the RSA department, they've just mentioned, like the Continuous Improvement Program and the Pilot Holistic Review, that came from ATRT3 recommendations.

So Alice will take the floor, will guide us through the specific reviews update, as well afterwards as through the Work Stream 2 update. And after that, she's going to be complemented and supported by Ab, who is a Senior Specialist from the Policy Development Support. So thanks a lot. Stay with us. And with that, I leave the floor to my colleague, Alice. Thank you, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. And hi, everyone. Alice Jansen here. So I'm pleased to report on the status of the specific reviews implementation to date. And let me start with the first visual. Next slide, please.

Thank you so much. So this graph here shows you the progress that has happened since the recommendations were first prioritized by the community in April and May of 2022. As most of you know, we're actively working with a cross-functional project team to get the improvements identified by the review teams operationalized. To give you an idea of progress, at the time of the prioritization, 67 percent of recommendations were not started. In comparison now, only 3 percent of those remaining not started. And we are happy to report that more than half of them, 55 percent to be precise are complete and 42 percent in progress. Next slide.

So across the four reviews, this translates as follows. We currently have a set of 39 recommendations not complete out of the 71 that were board approved. Thirty recommendations are in progress and then two are in not started. So looking at the green box first. Overall, and I'm sorry for the acronyms, but I think you are familiar with them by now. Accountability and Transparency Review Team to ATRT3. CCT is the Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice. RDS-WHOIS2 is the second registration directory service review. And then, SSR2 is the second iteration of the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS review. So overall, six ATRT3, five CCT, 12 RDS-WHOIS2 and 16 SSR2 recommendations are considered done.

And you may notice that we have hyperlinks on these. These hyperlinks take you to implementation documentation that offers context for how a recommendation was operationalized, but also provide evidence of that implementation. So this is key for accountability and transparency purposes, but also serves to help inform the subsequent review team's efforts in their assessment work.

So for instance, when RDS-WHOIS2—let's start with ATRT4. The implementation documentation of the ATRT3 recommendations will inform ATRT4 in their assessment work. So that's why we're building those. In addition, what we're also planning to do is that once an implementation project for a given review completes in full, we will produce a closing report that will assemble all of the relevant information in one single location. All right. So now let's look at the in-progress recommendations as well as not started. Next slide, please.

So all of the remaining recommendations are in progress with exception of two SSR2 recommendations that are on hold due to some dependencies. Rest assured, however, we are monitoring them to unlock them as soon as feasible. They're both dependent on the completion of another SSR2 recommendation. So this gives us a set of 30 recommendations for which work is ongoing. The ATRT3 recommended a set of improvements intended for the review process. The Pilot Holistic Review and Pilot Continuous Improvement Program for which you've just received an update from Jason and Evin are examples of projects that go towards addressing these ATRT3 recommendations.

The org is also working to improve transparency as it relates to SSR. We also have a number of data collection efforts on the set of CCT recommendations. Some of which require some surveys to be conducted. Additional examples of topics include the establishment of a consensus plan for future root DNS key algorithm rollovers as well as furthering the documentation that supports strategic planning. So there's a lot of different topics here that are covered by these recommendations and which we are overseeing and working towards.

So we publish implementation updates on a quarterly basis. They really are a great resource if you'd like to know more about the plans, the estimated completion dates and so on. They also include a number of visuals and graphs that help you understand what is happening and know where the progress is. A number of recommendations are scheduled to complete in the second quarter. So we really hope to have more good news to report in the next implementation updates.

I believe there's a resource slide at the end of the presentation where you can find the links to our wiki and org pages as well. They are a good resource as well to keep a finger on the pulse of progress overall. So I think I will pause here for Q&A on the specific reviews, implementation updates. And then we'll dive into Work Stream 2 right after this. Yvette, over to you for Q&A. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Thank you, Alice. Okay. Currently I don't have anything in the Q&A pod. I don't see any hands up. Going once going twice. No, I think we are good.

ALICE JANSEN:

Okay, great. Thank you so much. I think we can move on to the Work Stream 2 updates. Thank you very much. So let me start with a brief introduction of what Work Stream 2 is. Next slide, please.

The enhancing ICANN accountability is a unique review. This process was created at the time of the IANA stewardship transition. There's a graph here that helps you understand the connection. Work was divided into two phases at the time. Work Stream 1 focused on the accountability improvements essential for the transition to happen, whereas Work Stream 2 was dedicated to topics for which implementation was not required for the success of the transition. So the Cross Community Working Group on Work Stream 2 concluded its work in 2018. The board approved the recommendations in 2019 with the understanding it would be a multi-year implementation project.

So Work Stream 2 overall entails a set of 65 recommendations for the organization to implement, but also 37 for the community groups to address as applicable. And my colleague, Abraham will walk you through the community progress in a moment. Examples of Work Stream 2 topics, to name a few, include diversity, whistleblower policy, staff accountability, accountability of supporting organizations, advisory committees, ICANN's documentary information disclosure policy, also known as DIDP. So there's a number of topics and issues in these recommendations. Next slide.

I'm not seeing the slide. I hope it's up. Thank you so much. So this graph here that you see on the slide shows progress over time for the 65 recommendations in ICANN org's portfolio. Currently, 79 percent of them are complete, 18 are in progress and three are in a not started box. We're using May 2024 here as a data point to make sure that you have the latest numbers. We do expect more recommendations to complete by end of this calendar quarter. Next slide.

Okay. So essentially, we have 14 recommendations left to complete, 12 of which are in progress, two are not started due to some dependencies. So this means that 51 of them are done, and we have implementation documentation that you're most welcome to click on if you're interested in seeing the results of that work. I'm sure we'll have the slides ready on the session details for you to go to. At this stage, we still have one jurisdiction recommendation left, one under SO or AC accountability that aims to establish a process for adding a new supported language.

One recommendation on transparency of board deliberations. One that has to do with the whistleblower policy, and then one recognition under DIDP that serves to increase transparency on payments to suppliers. Also, there's a set of ombuds office-related recommendations. ICANN works with the former ombuds on updating the framework to bring their requested strategic focus. However, recommendations now are contingent upon appointment of the ombuds, for which there's a temporary board search committee that has been established, and we expect the new ombuds to be active in planning for and undertaking some of that implementation work as well.

So similar to specific reviews, we have quarterly reports for this implementation project in which you find useful information. The quarterly updates also address community implementation, which is a big portion of this project as well. And beyond these reports, we of course have our wiki and org pages, and that's a great way again to keep a finger on the pulse of progress. So I'm now going to give the microphone to my colleague, Abraham, who will walk you through the community's Work Stream 2 implementation journey. Ab, the floor is yours, and thank you for your attention.

ABRAHAM SELBY:

Thanks. Thanks so much, Alice, for the for the great explanation and creating all this framework, so that we can report on the progress. Can we go to the next slide, please?

Thank you. So here, similar to the org implementation, you can see states of community implementation. Here, we don't have any

recommendations left in the not started box, since we completed two recommendations recently. Thanks to the Work Stream 2 Community Coordination Group. These are recommendations 1.1 and 1.7. These helped to start the implementation of [inaudible] to diversity recommendations namely 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5. And these will be implemented by the groups individually. And once the implementation starts, these efforts will be continuous. They won't be one-off implementations.

We are also in progress in implementing recommendations. These are guidelines for [inaudible] 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Regarding 2.1 and 2.3, we had some progress among five SOs and ACs. That is five because five groups are part of the empowered community administration. While 2.1 and 2.2 are being implemented individually by them. We had a good progress. We are just waiting for one group for them to complete implementation and then we will move to implementing 2.3 collectively by all groups.

And also, recommendation six, which is SO/AC accountability. We have 18 recommendations in progress. They are distributed between accountability, transparency, participation, outreach and update to policies and procedures. We are working on this with all the groups including SOs, ACs, RALOs, stakeholder groups and constituencies. Next quarter, we are going to focus on stakeholder groups and constituencies implementation since they are a little bit behind in implementing this accountability recommendations. Next slide, please.

Thank you. This is more like a background slide. This will help you to understand how the community directed recommendations implementation is being done. This will help you to understand which recommendations are being implemented individually by community groups and which are being implemented collectively by community coordination group. I will keep this short because you have already seen this several times. Next slide, please.

Thank you. And here, I will report on status of community group's individual implementation. As I said before, there are recommendations that are being implemented individually. These are recommendation six that are accountability, transparency, participation, outreach and policy and procedures. And also, we have recommendation 2.1 and 2.2 that are related to empowered community and they are being implemented individually again. And thanks to the implementation of recommendations 1.1 and 1.7 by the Work Stream 2 Community Coordination Group, now we have moved this diversity 1.3, 4 and 5 recommendations from not started to in progress.

And as you can see, all diversity recommendations are in progress here. We are reporting the percentages here, but naturally, the number of recommendations in each category differs. In diversity, we have three recommendations to be implemented by 21 groups while empowered community has five groups only. And you can see how they are being worked on and how complete they are. Thanks to the efforts and thanks to the groups being transparent. This shows that transparency recommendations are completed mostly. They were mostly about how

transparent the calls are, how transparent the decisions groups are taking are and you can find more about our quarterly report here. And I think I am done with this. So next slide and over to you, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you very much. Ab, I think we are opening this for Q&A. Yvette, can you help? Thank you so much.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

So do we have any questions from the group? I don't see anything in the Q&A pod and I don't currently see any hands up. I want to make sure I don't miss that. Any questions from anyone? Okay. It looks like we don't have any questions from the group. So I will give it over to Giovanni Seppia with closing remarks. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Yvette. And with this, I'm going to draw this session to a close. I'd like to thank all the attendees. The speakers, Larisa, Jason, Evin, Alice and Ab. I'd like also to thank all the interpreters for their support and patience with some of us speaking sometimes faster. So sorry about that. Sometimes we get trapped in the acronyms and the way we speak among ourselves. We should keep this in mind for any session in the future to make those sessions more and more accessible.

I would like also to inform you that this slide deck will be posted on the session web page immediately after this call. The session slide deck contains an appendix with resource lists, links, as well as the Pilot

Holistic Review history and the continuous improvement history and other materials that you may find useful for you if you like to have a deep dive in any of the topics we touched base this time.

I would also like to thank the board members that have been attending this session. And with that, stay tuned with us with all the links that we have provided you and we'll remain in touch. There is plenty of work that we will make together and thanks again. Have a nice rest of the day, wherever you are. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]