
ICANN81 | Prep Week – ICANN Reviews Update
Thursday, October 31, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:30 PM TRT

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Recording in progress. Thank you. Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN 81 Prep Week Reviews Update on Thursday, October 31st at 18:00 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux, and Madeleine Werbelow and myself will be your remote participation managers for this webinar. This session is being recorded and both the recording and the slide deck presentation will be posted on the ICANN 81 prep week reviews update session page. And that link will be posted shortly in the chat for your access.

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. During the question and answer discussion portions at the end of each presentation, feel free to raise your hand if you have a comment or a question or you can follow some noted formats that we'll be placing in the chat.

Interpretation for this session is provided and it will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, and Portuguese. Click on the interpretation icon in the Zoom toolbar and select the language you

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.

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

To ensure transparency of the participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. Now we'll go to the agenda slide for today's webinar. We will have some introductions and we'll also be covering some opportunities for community participation.

And with that, I will hand the floor over to our Senior Vice President of Global Domains and Strategy, Theresa Swinehart.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Hi, everybody, and happy 31st of October. I can't believe we're already in October. I look forward to seeing some of you at the ICANN meeting in person and then obviously otherwise online and remotely. So just as a bit of introduction, first of all, thank you for taking the time to join this webinar and to participate and really look forward to this ongoing conversation. Today, you're going to be hearing from the team or teams actually, the amount of work that's really been underway in the area of reviews generally and that relates to the status of the reviews-related work and then upcoming work that's occurring both by the team that is supporting reviews that are underway and the work there and the team that is dealing and handling all the implementation in relation to the specific reviews and Work Stream 2 of the Enhanced ICANN

Accountability, which I know is something that is being worked on very, very hard.

From that standpoint, overall, as you know, the reviews program encompasses two different kinds of reviews historically, and that relates to specific reviews. Specific reviews are those that have been conducted by community-appointed review teams to look at ICANN's fulfillment of various commitments, such as accountability and transparency, security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS, and those are also captured in obviously the bylaws. And then there's organizational reviews, and those examine the structure, the continued purpose, effectiveness, and accountability of the supporting organizations and advisory committees in the NomCom to the constituents. And historically, these reviews have been conducted by third parties, and the community-led reviews relate to the specific reviews. And the community-led reviews for the Accountability and Transparency, ATRT3, had recommended evolving the organizational reviews into a continuous improvements program, which you'll be hearing about shortly around that. And I'll touch on as part of our ongoing effort to address reviews.

Reviews generally, and specifically, have been part of the longstanding element of ICANN's evolution in accountability as a multi-stakeholder organization to serve its mission. And we've completed several cycles of these reviews over the past years, and I know many of you who've been involved have seen the fluctuation and the intensity several times, many reviews running at the same time, and then also many recommendations coming in at the same time. And so there's been a

collective sense, and we've been hearing from community members as well, that how could we make reviews work better and be undertaken differently? And I think this is a very important conversation to be looking at. It's not that one shouldn't be handling them and doing them, but what is the intended purpose? And is there a way to do them differently based on the experiences that we've seen over the past years and your experiences as well?

And with that, as you're aware, there's many efforts underway to look at some of these. I'd mentioned the work on implementing a continuous improvements program that's underway and progressing very, very well. There's the work on the pilot holistic review that had recently begun its work. And we have a team of community volunteers that's looking at how the eventual holistic review could work. And this could provide additional input on the direction to be supported by the community and then eventually approved by the board on some of the efforts that we could do there. Combining it obviously with other areas underway, including the continuous improvements program and how that and eventual holistic review together could be a factor in how we improve reviews. There's also the work on the life cycle of reviews project that's underway there as well. There's upcoming, we're taking a look at in relation to the ATRT4, which is getting ready to get started early next year. The revised draft operating standards for specific reviews. And this is going to integrate some of the organization's proposed improvements to specific review process. And that will go out for public comment after ICANN 81.

So I know there's a lot of efforts and I know that there's a lot of dialogue on how can we improve the approach to reviews? What are the lessons learned? And with great gratitude to the community input in identifying different tools and paths around that, including the output of ATRT3. We have avenues to engage in those discussions with the community and look forward to that feedback. And then how we together can look at how to streamline some of this important area of work more generally. So with that, just a short introduction, I wanted to then turn it over to the teams to address the different areas. And then importantly, really look forward to your questions in continuing this conversation after we have the update. So thank you very much. And I think with that, I am handing it over to Jason.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you very much, Theresa. I appreciate the introduction. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Theresa covered a lot of the major components of reviews that we're working on at the moment. So I'm going to start us off by digging into the reviews program a little bit further and providing some more details about the current status and what's up and coming. Next slide, please.

So as Theresa mentioned, the reviews program is bylaws mandated. It consists of specific reviews and organizational reviews. And without going into all of them, I think you can see them on the screen. But just to highlight a couple of the improvement areas that Theresa had touched on. First, the life cycle of reviews, which is really specific to specific reviews and how effective and efficient those processes are. We're currently in the process of updating the operating standards for

specific reviews to reflect some of these efficiencies and process improvements, as Theresa noted, which we'll be going out for public comment following the next ICANN meeting, we believe in early December. Next, we have this nice little under construction sign coming out of ATRT, Accountability Transparency Review. This is showing that ATRT 3 had an output of two elements to improve reviews. The first, as Theresa noted again, was to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. So that's reflected here. And you'll hear more about that later. Next, you'll also see underneath that. It recommended a holistic review, essentially to look at similar elements that existed with organizational reviews and to provide some checks and balances on the continuous improvement program itself. So we'll see some of those elements in a little bit. I would like to highlight, you'll hear the continuous improvement program come up a couple of times, as well as the holistic review. Currently, the continuous improvement program is being piloted, as is the pilot holistic review. So although these were recommendations, they're currently in pilot phase, and we'll hear more about that in a moment. Next slide, please.

So now just to provide a quick update on some of the reviews that were discussed. So for specific reviews, the Registration Directory Service Review 3, RDS 3, has been deferred. Its future is to be determined by ATRT 4, which as per the board, and we'll see a visual of this in a little while, will make a decision to initiate that review in April of 2025. Next on the list, we see the Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review 3, SSR 3. This has been deferred and also will be determined by ATRT 4. Next, we have the Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review. This is also the second one, CCT 2. This has not yet been started,

but will be started after the next round opens up. And of course, we've mentioned this a couple times already, the Accountability and Transparency Review 4, ATRT 4, it has been deferred, but it will be initiated by the board no later than April 2025. And you can see that organizational reviews, all of them have been deferred, and you'll hear an update on the status of the continuous improvement program. The board will make a decision on the deferral of these reviews and the status of the continuous improvement program in June of 2025. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So, now, just to give you a sense of the different work streams where all these activities exist. So, first, we have the continuous improvement program. There's a community coordination group, which is currently developing a framework for continuous improvement. This is scheduled to go out for public comment in November, after which that is expected to transition into an assessment period for each individual SO and AC and the NomCom. And you'll see a little flag here denoting the board's decision in June of 2025.

The next work stream you see is the pilot holistic review, which, as Theresa noted, is currently under operation. It is expected to deliver its final report in December of 2025. After it's delivered to the board, the board will then open up a public comment proceeding and consider the final report. And you can see that both the CIP and the PHR have decision points with the board and, if they are approved, would still have to proceed through an amendment process. And just flagging in the work stream for the pilot holistic review, you do see, after board consideration, an eventual holistic review yet to be determined, not on

this scale. And finally, we have a work stream involving updates to the operating standards for specific reviews. So, currently in its drafting phase, but will go out for public comment in December. Following that, there will be a board decision. And this is expected to happen prior to the board initiating ATRT 4 and the planning, which will ideally commence the review in September of 2025. Next slide, please. We'll stop right here for a moment, since we went through some of the high-level elements of the reviews program, to see if anyone has any questions.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Any questions from anyone? I do not see anything in the Q&A pod. Oh, there is one from Avri in the chat. For ATRT 4, does no later than mean, A, we'll start with preprocesses by April 2025? How long are these preprocesses? And B, when will we, I think this meant, when will we start reviewing or will start reviewing? So, part A is they want to know about the preprocesses, are those by April 2025? And how long are those preprocesses? That's a two-part question.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you for the question, Avri. Some of these processes will be outlined in the updates to the operating standards for specific reviews, which, similar to the pilot holistic review, would ensure community alignment on the focus areas for the review. But if you recall the pathway forward for the pilot holistic review, it's somewhat similar, in that immediately following the initiation of ATRT 4, Org would take on that work, initial with all the planning, and as I noted, would initiate the

review ideally in September of 2025. So, all exactly what's going to happen will be determined by the public comment on the updates to the operating standards, but that is the general high-level timeline.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay, Jason, thank you. I don't see anything else in the Q&A. I don't see anything else in the chat. I do want to remind all speakers or anyone who's asking questions about the interpretation, so please slow down the speaking pace so we make sure we have accurate interpretation. Other than that, back to you, Jason. Thank you.

JASON KEAN:

Great. Thank you, Yvette. Okay, so getting right into the pilot holistic review, going over the background initially. So, as mentioned before, ATRT 3 developed recommendation 3.5 calling for the review. The board approved recommendation 3.5 as a pilot. The community developed the terms of reference for the pilot holistic review over two years and two public comment proceedings. And then the board initiated the pilot holistic review with specific directives. Next slide, please.

So, now we're just going to look at a high-level timeline of the pilot holistic review. So, the call for volunteers opened in May of 2024, closed in June. We had the review team selection process with the SOs and ACs happen through June and August. And the review team was announced on the 13th of September. The team actually had its inaugural meeting on the 30th, and the work is underway. We expect the public comment on the draft report to be sometime after May to allow for the proceeding

to be open for an extended period of time, and the review team to have an adequate amount of time to address all public comments received during that proceeding and to make any necessary adjustments. And as I noted before, the final report is expected to be published and delivered to the board in December of 2025. Next slide, please.

Here we have the 16-member list of the pilot holistic review team. And I would like to just call out one process improvement that is in the operating standards that existed in this process. The SO and AC chairs did select the co-chairs as part of their final selection process in balancing diversity. And the co-chairs for this review are Chris Disspain and Sophie Hey. Next slide, please.

So, the pilot holistic review's purpose is really four things as defined in the pilot holistic review terms of reference. The first is to define the relationship between future holistic reviews and organizational reviews or the continuous improvement program. The next is to address, based upon community input, methods for future holistic reviews, including the makeup of review teams and their roles. Also, to define the roles of the community structures, the board and org, and whether, if so, how external parties should be involved. Lastly, to consider what bylaws amendments may be necessary to ensure that future holistic reviews can be conducted in accordance with ATRT3's recommendation and the findings of this review. All of this is currently under discussion at the beginning of the pilot holistic review team's work. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So, two objectives that were identified in the terms of reference were to meet the requirements defined in the ATRT3 final report and to develop methodologies and guidelines for future holistic

reviews to ensure that they yield the outcomes intended by ATRT3. Also, to address the gaps that were identified by the board. Some primary deliverables here. Our guidelines for the review of the effectiveness of the various inter SO, AC NomCom collaboration mechanisms. Guidelines for the review of the accountability of SO, ACs or constituent parts to their members and constituencies. Guidelines for the review of SO, AC, NomCom as a whole. And guidelines for the review of the continuous improvement efforts of the SO, AC, NomCom based on good practices. Next slide, please.

So, there is an engagement and communication plan that has been drafted, essentially laying out the points of potential engagement along the way throughout the duration of the review. And depending upon the holistic reviews progress, calling out, there may be engagement at ICANN sessions, depending on the value that may bring based off of the status of work at that point in time. There will, however, be continuous updates via the pilot holistic review wiki page. Pilot holistic review team members to their respective SO and AC groups. And the pilot team's board member to the OEC and the board. Next slide, please.

Okay, we covered a lot of information there, so I'll pause here to see if there's any questions.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay, I don't see anything in the Q&A pod. We did have one question from Avri in the chat, but I think that might have gotten answered by Larissa in the chat. I think we're good on that. Anyone else? I don't see

any hands up. Going once. Going twice. Okay. I think we're good. So, Jason, I think I'll let you continue on.

JASON KEAN:

Thank you, Yvette. And I'll actually now hand it over to my colleague, Evin, to discuss the continuous improvement program. Evin, please.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thanks so much, Jason. And hello, everyone. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Evin Erdoğan speaking. I'll walk us through evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. For context, as Theresa mentioned moments ago, organizational reviews assess the effectiveness of ICANN's supporting organizations, advisory committees, and the nominating committee. Historically, they've been conducted by independent examiners. The issue observed by many community members over the years is that organizational reviews were time-consuming and costly and, on the most part, did not produce useful recommendations and outcomes. The third accountability and transparency review team published these recommendations to address these community concerns. Recommendation 3.6 calls for ICANN Org to work with the ICANN community to establish this continuous improvement program. And the outputs from the continuous improvement work would inform the eventual holistic review, as my colleague Jason just outlined in the previous section.

As noted, all organizational reviews have been deferred with support from all of the community to allow time for the implementation work to

proceed. The board will consider the progress toward evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program in June 2025. So the goal for ICANN is to demonstrate significant progress on the related continuous improvement program implementation by then. This presents an opportunity for ICANN to replace organizational reviews with a more flexible process that is responsive to the unique needs of ICANN's organizational structures and for the ICANN community to make meaningful continuous improvements. Next slide, please.

So earlier this year, in January 2024, ICANN launched a Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group. The Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group, or CIPCCG, is a community group. The ICANN community demonstrated strong interest in contributing to the evolution of organizational reviews into this continuous improvement program, with 21 out of 22 of the groups across the community represented in the coordination group. This recommendation called for ICANN Org to work with each supporting organization, advisory committee, and the nominating committee to establish a continuous improvement program that shares a common base, but that will also allow for customization so as to best meet the needs of each individual organizational structure. Many of you know from being a part of the ICANN community how different the organizational structures are. So in line with this recommendation, the community coordination group considered various continuous improvement program models to apply to the ICANN context, and they determined that a principles, criteria, and indicator-based framework is fit for purpose.

So what is this framework? Broadly speaking, principles describe the objectives of the continuous improvement program. The principles developed by the community coordination group stem from the existing organizational review objectives described in the ICANN bylaws, and they apply to each of the organizational structures. Criteria are the ways to comply with the principle. The groups developed three to five criteria relevant to their groups, which define how a principle will be achieved without themselves being a measure of performance. Indicators are a measure of performance. They define how the criteria will be measured. They can include metrics, assessments, or new processes put in place to meet the criteria. Okay, next slide, please.

So the group is tasked with achieving four things, three of which they have already completed this year. They have developed a shared understanding of the meaning of continuous improvement, considered methodologies for effective continuous improvement programs, and agreed on the methodology or framework that is fit for ICANN purpose. And currently they are finalizing this continuous improvement program framework to be used by each organizational structure. It will be published for public comment prior to adoption by each supporting organization, advisory committee, and then on. Next slide, please.

Okay, so this slide is specific to the community coordination group's work this year. Their work was divided into four phases with the volunteers working with their groups to formulate and test the draft framework in advance of ICANN public comment. Throughout 2024, all community volunteers have been consistently attending the community coordination group meetings every two weeks, with the

majority of those attending 80% or more of the meetings, which is great. The community volunteers are engaging consistently throughout the year, both within the community coordination group and with their respective groups to develop the draft framework. For example, one community representative noted that they conducted two and a half months of continuous engagement and hard work with their organizational structure, including around 10 working sessions devoted to this effort. Other representatives to the community coordination group formed their own subgroup to discuss and align on the continuous improvement program and how it would be implemented within their own organizational structure. And several groups have volunteered to provide illustrative examples of their work, including the Root Server System Advisory Committee, the Nominating Committee, and the At-Large Advisory Committee, as well as the regional At-Large organizational structure for the APAC region. You can see these examples on the workspace for the group, which I think Jessica will place into the chat, please. If not, awesome. Thank you, Jessica. So ahead of ICANN 81, the group is finalizing documents for the public comment proceeding, which is anticipated to open on Thursday, the 21st of November, after the annual general meeting. They're discussing the draft Continuous Improvement Program framework and settling discussions on the principles guiding the program. After ICANN 81, the community coordination group plans to host a webinar to draw attention to the public comment and answer any community questions on the framework. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So finally, this is a high-level slide showing what happens after the public comment for this effort. The coordination group will

address input received where relevant. The first assessment period would then begin, estimated to begin in the first quarter of 2025 and conclude at the end of 2027 for a period of about three years. And the second assessment period would begin after that. The continuous improvement program will include a regular survey of members and participants and a summary of continuous improvements would be published at least every three years. The results of these assessments would inform the eventual holistic review. More details of the program and its assessment periods are provided in the draft framework that will be published for public comment. So that's a high-level overview of all the work that's been conducted by the community this year to develop a continuous improvement program. We look forward to supporting the work of the ICANN community in this significant task and encourage the community to follow the work on the continuous improvement program and provide input to their respective representatives as work progresses. So if you have any questions or comments, please feel free to ask or reach out to me and the team. Thank you very much.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Okay, thank you, Evin. I don't have any questions in the Q&A pod and I don't have anything in the chat either. Anybody want to raise their hand and ask any questions? I want to allow a moment to do that. Going once, going twice. No? Okay. I think we're good. So carrying on with the presentation. Carrying on with the presentation. Jason, I believe it's over to you.

JASON KEAN:

Yes, thank you, Yvette, and thank you, Evin. Okay, so now going back to when this was mentioned previously, some of the improvements to specific reviews that we're looking at, and I discussed and made a couple of points on previously. A quick history of specific reviews. ICANN conducted eight specific reviews following the affirmation of commitments in 2009. In the early 2020s, the ICANN board, late 2010s actually, ICANN board undertook work to improve specific reviews. This was halted when ATRT 3 was initiated. And finally, ICANN initiated the Life Cycle of Reviews Project to continue the board's work and build on lessons learned over numerous cycles. Next slide, please.

So a quick overview of the operating standards for specific reviews so everyone understands their purpose and what they do. They provide standards and criteria by which the community-led review should be conducted based on the bylaws provisions for specific reviews. They ensure that reviews are conducted in a transparent, predictable, and efficient manner. And finally, they are amended from time to time to reflect lessons learned and to implement necessary process changes via public comment and board adoption. So this is actually all outlined in the existing operating standards for specific reviews. Next slide, please.

So some really high-level highlights of some of the proposed updates that you will see in that you will see in the operating standards proposed revisions coming up in December. Two big elements that I'd like to flag for you. The development of review focus areas before starting a specific review within the scope of a review defined in the bylaws with input from the community. So the focus areas help inform

the planning for each review, including the development of the terms of reference, and facilitate SO, AC alignment on the specific focus for each review. So this is to say to Avri's question, a lot of this alignment and planning can be ramped up prior to the inaugural meeting of the review team because there's already broad community alignment on what is specifically going to be looked at for a review. This is to say not what's in the larger scope in the bylaws, but what a review is specifically tasked with doing. And next to review team follows a standardized review process driven by the focus areas. The process facilitates clear research findings, well-supported problems and or opportunities that require action, and well-informed recommendations that directly address problems and or opportunities and incorporates ICANN SME input. So this is to say there's a clearly defined process to conduct research, to develop findings, to pull out of that findings that actually need to be addressed and are prioritized, and to develop recommendations if they're needed to address those findings and specific problems or opportunities. To kind of pull a thread through and put breadcrumbs so that when a draft report is put through, everyone has a clear understanding of where those recommendations came from, why they're even needed, and when at the end of the day a final report is delivered to the board, the board has a really robust understanding of why these recommendations are needed and specifically what they're looking to address and desired outcomes as well. So just a really high-level overview of what the revisions are targeting. Next slide please. And I'll stop here to see if anyone has any questions on those high-level points that I did just cover.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay do we have any questions? I don't have anything in the Q&A pod and I don't have anything currently in the chat. Oh I just saw Avri's hand go up. Please go ahead Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks, Avri speaking and I didn't get it typed in quickly enough otherwise I wouldn't have bothered you with speaking. I have a question on, I like the idea of incorporates SME, what was the exact wording? Incorporates SME, I forgot the last word, it was on one of your slides. And I wanted to ask, first of all I think it's great, it's part of incorporating you know the staff or whomever more and more into the multi-stakeholder process which is something that I think is very good. But when you say incorporates, is it considered or it actually is incorporated per se as you get the advice from the SME and it's incorporated in the result. And so I'm really wondering about that word incorporates. Thanks.

JASON KEAN: Thank you, Avri, for the question. So I'll address it at a high level first because I think the ICANN org participating in that process especially with recommendations is something that you will see when these recommendations reach implementation status. Right? So what we're doing is we're looking to plant those seeds of implementation early on in the process to look at feasibility, to understand what would actually be required so that those elements can be fed into the review team's assessment of their own recommendation. So that's what we're looking at here so that the review team has a clear understanding of what would

be required when they deliver recommendations and what that process could look like. Because we think that's an important part of producing that recommendation in the first place so it's well informed and understood and everyone's on the same page of what shepherding that recommendation forward would look like.

AVRI DORIA:

Can I follow up? So incorporates input is really a priori. The input from the SMEs from staff is the baseline upon which the review team is allowed to build. Is that the correct understanding?

LARISSA GURNICK:

Hi, everyone. Thank you, Avri, for the question. If I could maybe expand a little bit. It's to provide the review team with the information for their consideration so that they're informed as they develop the recommendations and think through how they might be implemented. So it's really meant to provide input to be considered by the review team, not to mandate that it be a baseline, but that it be considered as hopefully useful information, all with the idea of expediting and kind of making things work more efficiently from the time that final recommendations reach the board and the board puts them out for public comment so that the board understands community is supportive and hopefully it can all move forward toward implementation more expeditiously.

JASON KEAN: Okay, thank you. So it means consider strongly, which I think is wonderful. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, thank you, Avri and Larissa. I don't have anything else in the Q&A pod. I don't see anything else in the chat. Any hands up? No? Going once, going twice. Okay, I think we are good. So, Jason, I believe this is back to you.

JASON KEAN: Thank you, Yvette. So some upcoming opportunities for community participation and input. The two previously mentioned ICANN public comment proceedings, one on the continuous improvement program framework, and the other on the operating standards for specific reviews. At ICANN 81 on Wednesday the 13th there will be a working session for the continuous improvement program coordination group. And the review support and accountability team will be providing engagement sessions with the ICANN community to provide updates on the status of the reviews program. You can reach out to rsacoordinators@icann.org to schedule these. I will be on the ground in Istanbul. So, if you're interested in seeing me and talking about some of this stuff in greater depth, I'd be happy to have those conversations. And lastly, other events, in December, the community coordination group will have a webinar on the draft CIP framework, and the date is yet to be announced so stay tuned on that. Okay, so that wraps it up for the ICANN reviews program and reviews support and accountability.

And on that note, I'd actually like to shift some gears here and hand it over to Alice to talk about reviews implementation. Alice, please.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you so much, Jason. I think Giovanni would like to share some opening remarks before we embark on our journey. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Alice. And thank you, Jason, for all the updates. I'm happy to introduce the last part of today's session that is going to be presented by the Implementation Operations Department and also the Policy Department. ICANN Implementation Operations Department is responsible for the effective execution, delivery, and management of implementation projects resulting from non-policy recommendations. Those recommendations serve to improve processes, systems, or practices across the organization and beyond. Examples of non-policy recommendations are the recommendations coming from specific reviews, as well as recommendations coming from the Work Stream 2 of the cross-community working group on announcing ICANN accountability. The Implementation Operations Department, as I said, looks after and is responsible for the implementation of other non-policy recommendations coming from cross-community working groups, including those coming from the cross-community working group on auction proceeds that are at the foundation of the ICANN grant program, whose first cycle was launched last spring and for which we are working hard to make sure that successful applications are granted in a timely manner. So, you've been hearing a lot about

reviews, and now you're going to hear about the recommendations coming from those reviews and where they stand. And with that, and without further ado, I'd like to leave the floor to my colleague Alice Janssen, Director within the Implementation Operations Department. Thank you, Alice. The floor is yours.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you so much, Giovanni. Hi, everyone. My name is Alice Janssen, and I will start today with a summary slide of how the 135 recommendations that emerged from the most recent review efforts were processed. Next slide. So, what has changed since the ICANN 80 prep week updates? The key development is located in the box of recommendations pending board consideration. Four CCT pending recommendations were addressed through a board action in July, and I will post the link in the chat for you now, if you're interested in reading that. So, this leaves us now with one remaining pending recommendation, an SSR 2 recommendation, to be precise. The good news is that the dependency tied to this remaining pending recommendation was recently unlocked following board action in late September on the Name Collision Analysis Study 2 reports. So, work is ongoing to get this recommendation moving out of the pending box. So, now I suggest we zoom in on the implementation status updates of the 71 recommendations that you see listed here as approved by the board. Next slide, please.

Thank you so much. So, I'm pleased to share that we no longer have recommendations in the Not Started status. For those of you who attended the ICANN 80 Prep Week webinar, you may remember that we

had two left in the Not Started, but wheels are now in motion on those. So, this translates to a set of 27 recommendations currently in progress, which is equivalent to 38% in our pie charts. On the next slide, you will see an overview of the recommendations that were effectively brought to life, so effectively completed. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So, we have currently a total of 44 recommendations, equivalent to 62% in our pie charts, which have been operationalized. Three more compared to what was shared with you in the last Prep Week session we had in end of May. The hyperlinks that you see here are links to the implementation documentation. So, implementation documentation, for those who are not familiar with this concept, it's a summary of the actions taken to implement the recommendation, but also helps to set out and articulate the rationale for why desired improvements were operationalized as such. It's an essential piece of information for context, and that will guide the subsequent review teams in their assessment work as well. But also, it's essential for the accountability and transparency of the process. So, we make sure that everything is documented appropriately. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So, this slide offers you a breakdown of the status per review efforts. There's currently a set of seven recommendations for ATRT3, 12 for CCT, seven for SSR2, and one for RDS WHOIS2, which the various teams across the ICANN organization are working to address in a meaningful fashion, but also cost-effectively. While taking, of course, into account the priority labels that we've received from the community as part of the prioritization efforts, which our colleagues from the planning team lead.

So, you've just received some key updates from our colleagues on some of the work that is going into addressing the ATRT3 recommendations with the CIP pilots, as well as the holistic review pilots. But there's also ongoing initiatives to improve the planning process to address the ATRT 3 projects, and we have a number of data collection-related efforts that are emerging from the CCT implementation. And also, we're working to deploy additional reporting, disclosures, and so on as part of SSR2 implementation. So, a lot is being worked on, and the team is committed to bringing these to a conclusion, and all being well, currently we foresee that six additional recommendations will move to complete by the end of this calendar year. The next slide illustrates how we're doing across the quarters to absorb the desired improvements that the review teams identified during their review cycle. Next slide, please.

Thank you so much. So, we're pleased to see the disappearance of recommendations categorized as red, not started, alongside a steady increase in the green complete category. This reflects our ongoing efforts towards progress and effective implementation. And before we move on to the next topic, I do wish to mention that we deliver implementation reports on a quarterly basis. So, they serve as a comprehensive resource should you wish to have more information. They provide in-depth insights, as well as updates on initiatives and estimated completion dates, and some of the challenges we may be encountering, and so on. So, they're really a good resource to use. In addition, we also have wiki and org pages, which are a great way to keep a finger on the pulse of progress. And please don't worry, there's a slide towards the end of the presentation with all the links that will be helpful

to you. So, I'll stop here and see if there are any questions that I can help address before we move on to Work Stream 2.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Anyone have any questions? I don't see anything in the chat or on the Q&A pod. Anyone can feel free to raise their hand if they'd like and go ahead and unmute and ask your question. We don't see any questions.

ALICE JANSEN:

Okay. Thank you so much. Okay, so onwards, let's go to Work Stream 2, please. So genesis of Work Stream 2 goes back to the IANA stewardship transition. The enhancing ICANN accountability process was developed to provide assurance at the time that ICANN would remain accountable in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the US government.

The work was divided into two phases. The first Workstream focused on accountability improvements essential for the transition to happen. Whereas the second Workstream, Work Stream 2, focused on topics for which implementation was not required for the success of the transition. So the work was conducted by a cross-community working group, and the board approved the outputs in 2019 with the understanding that it would be a multi-year implementation project. 65 recommendations were generated for the organization to implement, and the community groups were invited to address 37 recommendations as applicable on a given set of topics as well. My colleague, Alperen Eken, Senior Specialist for the Policy Development Support, will take you through the community implementation updates

in a moment. But before we do that, let me take you through the org-related updates. Next slide, please. Thank you so much.

So of the 65 recommendations in our portfolio, 54 of them are complete, 10 in progress, and one is not started. So this translates effectively into 83% of the recommendations in the complete box, the green box, which is my all-time favorite color. With the recent appointment of an Ombuds, we expect that the implementation work to address the Ombuds office-related recommendations, as you can see here on the slide, still there, will progress well in the next few months. And the other recommendations listed here are expected to conclude in the calendar year. There's also one recommendation in not started, which is tied to an Ombuds office-related improvements, and we'll make sure to monitor this very closely so we can take this to the next steps. Next slide, please.

So this graph here shows progress over time for the recommendations in ICANN Org's portfolio. Again, the team remains steadfast in our commitment to bring this project to a successful close, and we're currently targeting to possibly complete this by the end of fiscal year, so June 2025. Once that happens, we will work on producing a final closing report in which we will assemble and summarize all of the implementation documentation and potentially also refresh some of the information from, you know, cascading activities and so on as appropriate. Similar to specific reviews, we produce quarterly reports on Work Stream 2 as well, and these reports also address the community implementation. But now I will leave the floor to my colleague, Alp, who will take you through the community's Work

Stream 2 implementation journey. Alp, the floor is yours. Thank you so much.

ALPEREN EKEN:

Thank you so much, Alice. Maybe I mentioned this during our last prep week meeting as well, but my favorite color is blue, but changing the complete color to blue would confuse people, I guess. So we'll stick with your favorite color. So again, my name is Alperen Eken, and I'll talk about the Work Stream 2 community implementation. If we go to the next slide. Thank you. So as you can see, we have 13 community-directed recommendations completed by all the groups now. During our last update, this number was 12. The latest recommendation that was completed by all groups is the 6.2.5, the Transparency-Related Recommendation, which indicates a recommendation on records of open meetings being publicly available. Also, we have many recommendations in progress, some diversity recommendations for community, several recommendations regarding empowered community, and lastly, SO, AC accountability recommendations that are good practices. We have no recommendations that are in the not-started bucket here. So no red recommendations. Next slide, please.

You have seen these slides a couple of times. So we believe that this is a helpful one as a reference. So you can, as usual, download this presentation later and look at this slide for reference where the community implementation is being directed or being addressed at. And next slide, please.

On this slide, you can see a thematic implementation summary of individually implemented recommendations. As you can see, we are doing well with the implementation of accountability, transparency, participation, outreach, and policy and procedures. Our community groups are working on empowered community recommendations. They are a little bit slower because mostly they require some changes in their charters or operating documents. That is taking time. Implementation of diversity recommendations, all of them are blue, will be implemented similar to other recommendations. ICANN org is providing staff support and necessary tools and community groups will work on their own pace for these recommendations, but they are not good practices like recommendation six. So they will be implemented. So next slide, please.

In our last slide, you can see, and also this is the new slide, you can see status of each community group, including SOs, ACs, RALOs, and GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies. As you can see, some groups completed their work and some of them have their work in progress. This means that they are either working on their operating procedures or charters, they are forming a relevant infrastructure for the implementation or they are still discussing the implementation of the recommendation. Also, we have some groups that still have some recommendations that they haven't started implementing yet. We are supporting the groups whenever they reach out or ask for staff support if we are not supporting these activities for them yet. So this is all for Work Stream 2 community implementation. And back over to you, Alice or Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Alp. I'll take over and see if there is any question in the Q&A pod or in the chat. I was just monitoring the chat. I see that one question was already answered. Any other question on this last part of today's prep week session on reviews.

Avri DORIA: Apologies for asking so many questions. On the ombuds changes, has that all been sort of pre-staged and our new ombuds is sort of a part of and aware of this process? Or is that something yet to be developed in terms of how to sort of, you know, this is almost like one of those remodeling the airplane while she's flying. So I'm just wondering if you could say a little bit more about how that will unfold. Thanks.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Avri. Thank you so much for your question and your interest. So we know the ombuds framework was initially amended. There was work going towards amending that. And then with the departure of the former ombuds, everything was put on hold. And there was this process, as you know, to recruit a new ombuds person. And as part of the process for finding the ombuds, there was consideration given to the Work Stream 2 related recommendations in building that job description and so on. And now that we have this person on board, I know that there's a liaising happening with the new ombuds person to address the recommendations and move forward on them. So yes, I can confirm that there are follow-ups happening and the ombuds person is fully informed and taking part in those conversations. I hope that addresses your question.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, yes. Hopefully in the future, we'll get a little bit more of a view of how it's unfolding, but thank you very much.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you. I don't know if we have our colleague from the legal team, if you or Sam would like to compliment what Alice just said.

SAM EISNER: Thanks everyone. This is Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal. I think Alice covered it really well. The board was clearly working on some of the items around the ombudsman framework. And as Alice stated, took those items into account when building out the new role for the ombudsman. And that's been part of the consideration all along. And so I think, you know, we'll see as the new ombuds gets into her role and really starts engaging with it, as Alice said, she's fully aware of the recommendations, has already started thinking about how to make sure that she is embodying those recommendations well and moving forward with it. So while we don't have the detail to give you, Avri, about exactly how she's doing that, I think that's something that we'll be able to start seeing in the very short term over the next couple of months, as she's really stepping in and working on these items.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot, Sam. I see Sebastien hand up. Sebastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. One point that could be a detail for most of you, but for me, it's really important since the Work Stream 2, we keep trying to say ombuds. I know it's not an English word, but the correct word is ombuds. You can find the information about ombuds on ICANN Org. So it's important to refer to ombuds.

The question that Avri asked is really important, and I would like to add a point. One of the recommendations has not been implemented, and this one was a recommendation to create a committee, and the board has done the work that it thought it needed to do, but the community has not been listened to regarding the implementation of structures in the change of ombuds. So not only are we late regarding this, but we did not follow the suggestions, the recommendations, the proposals that came from the Work Stream 2. Now, of course, we will allow the new ombuds to complete her work, and I'm sure it will go well, but I do think that when the community proposes something, we need to implement it, and we need to implement it at the right time and not too late. Thank you very much.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Sébastien. Alice, would you like to join?

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you, Sébastien, for your question. I can say that this is not yet an in-progress recommendation because the truth is we are waiting for the official recommendation from the ombuds to have happened. It's the recommendation 5.3. This recommendation 5.8 has been set aside for now because we want to focus on the alignment with the new

recommendations that were made. I know that there has been a lot of work that has been put in place in these recommendations from the community, but once we have this work that is polished, that is very well implemented, then we will be able to focus on the recommendation 5.8. Thank you very much for your patience, and thank you for all the feedback that you send us. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Alice. Any other questions in the Q&A pod or in the chat?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: There's nothing in the chat and there's nothing in the Q&A pod. I'm just giving people a couple of seconds. Yep, we've gotten them all. And we don't see anybody else's hands up either. Any more questions, final call?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: So, thank you, Yvette. If there is no further question, I'd like to draw this session to a close. Today's presentation, as Yvette said at the very start, is going to be uploaded on this session webpage shortly. And also in this presentation, we'll find an appendix with useful resources in case you'd like to learn more about all the updates we have been providing you during today's session. With that, I'd like to thank all the speakers of today's presentation. So, Theresa, Jason, Evin, Alice, and Alperen. I'd like to thank all the support staff who have been working behind the scenes to make this session possible. Yvette, Sarah and Madeleine, all the interpreters. My apology if we have sometimes spoken too fast. We

are really, you know, it's a learning process. Every time you start speaking fast and then we say to ourselves, no, please speak slowly because there are interpreters that they have to facilitate this session in other languages. So thank you for your patience and for coping with the different accents and also the speed and the pace we went through during today's session. And also, big thanks to all the attendees. As you have heard, we have made a lot of progress. There is a lot of work ahead of us. Together we'll make it, as we have done over the past years. So thank you for all the support. Thank you again for attending today's session. I should say, trick or treat, considering the date. And all the best. Have a nice remaining day. And the session is officially closed. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]