HYDERABAD – Operating Standards Workshop to Socialize with Community
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 15:15 to 16:45 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

LARS HOFFMAN: All right, big subject, small crowd. Thank you for coming to this session. It's about the Operating Standards for Reviews.

As you may know, the new Bylaws have moved the organization reviews and now the specific reviews, which used to be the AoC Reviews. Another Bylaws and they call for a drafting of operating standards that set the parameters, if you want, of those reviews and complemented Bylaws because they're obviously not as detailed as some of this review process. But then, the amount of detail that this can offer review process required.

And so, this session is really about starting the discussion by drafting the review of operating standards. It's not about presenting any effects or any staff [inaudible] or initiatives but rather seeing how the community can come together and draft or create these operating standards that will hopefully guide the reviews in the future.

I have started with my colleagues in the MS Society Department to produce what we've called the Skeleton Document. So, that is really just something that kind of compiles the various subject

EN

area and issues that we think are important for the operating standards to feature, kind of compiled them in this sort of headline document. And so, we wanted to see what do you think about that whether there are any other issues that should be addressed, and then how we can work together to fill those issues and to draft the subjects and the various procedures that are necessary for this document to come together.

In doing so, I've obviously spent a little bit of time or we spent a little bit of time thinking about this document of what should feature. We've come up with really two categories. I'm not going to stick too much to this PowerPoint. I think we should really have a discussion.

There's two areas of categories, if you want, in the operating standards. I'm just going to move forward very quickly. Once that we recall if you're on substantive issues that probably need the most amount of community input. And then also, a much larger area, if you want, administrative issues.

There are really procedures and best practices that are in place that govern many of the reviews and they are almost taken by, granted by both staff and the community but that haven't been if you want to codify or centralize them in one specific place and that place should be the operating standards for the reviews.

The most substantive issues that are probably going to be requiring a lot of community input notably the nomination process for Review Teams, for the specific reviews. So the WHOIS Review, the SSR Review, Cheryl within this previous session pointed out that the WHOIS Review call for volunteers is just out and the SSR2 Review Security and Stability in fact is currently being – the Review Team is currently being put together by the SO and AC Chairs that have this role now and that the new Bylaws.

And there's other issues that probably require community input, the management of budgets for specific reviews, maybe something like a standing scope for organization reviews, currently organization reviews, the scope is set by the OEC and that would probably stay that way, the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

But there might be a good argument that some specific issues should feature of all the organization reviews such as how did that perform with regard to the ICANN identified work remit and scope.

And then, the issue of, for example, consensus levels in the specific Review Team, that is something that is nowhere written and that there have been ad hoc procedures in past reviews and something that could be standardized potentially.

And, the amendment process of this organization, of the operating standards. So once they have these operating standards on place, how can we then go about to amend them?

The administrative issues I've listed a couple of here. For example, the role of the working party in organizational reviews, the selection of the independent examiner, all these are processes that are in place and that are fairly uncontroversial. But that would be very useful to have that in one document if somebody wants to understand how reviews work and what the various steps are that are involved, and what are the various players that are involved that they can go to this document and inform themselves. Also it gives the community and staff a reassurance that the processes are really followed according to these rules and guidelines that we hopefully put together in the near future.

This is a little scary slide that – if I'm worried about my job security, I will quickly pull up on the PowerPoint. These are the reviews that are coming up over the next year. As you see, we are relatively busy. The big bulk is where we are. The big black vertical line I suppose it is, is where we are right now. And so, you can see there's a lot of reviews coming up, ATRT 3, the WHOIS Review is the call for volunteers is launched and then there is five organizational reviews that are supposed to start in 2017.

So, from the staff and the community perspective, it would be ideal if the operating standards be in place as these reviews roll out. But that on the other hand also, there's obviously some time constraint. We have to see how many different voices are going to be involved and how are they going to – how the community decides to kind of get together and proceed with the drafting process of those issues that are maybe more – require more community input than others that are more technical as I pointed out earlier.

Here is the last slide. We have created the wiki space for the operating standard procedures, the operating standards drafting processes and we put up the draft documents, namely the Skeleton, if you want, and just one of this, this very presentation. So that's all that's on that at the moment. As I said in the beginning, this is the start of the process and we hope we fill out the space as we proceed with our work.

Charla, could you upload the Skeleton?

I just want to quickly show you what we've come up with in terms of this mystery Skeleton Document. As Charla puts it up, it looks like a scary 12-page long document and it is 12 pages long but it really doesn't contain any controversial content, at least I don't hope so.

EN

The first page here, there's a few questions, I'll go back to these in just a minute. I just want to briefly go through this. So, I've provided some background introduction to reviews what they are. And then, you see the organizational reviews, the various organizations that come under reviews.

Then this blue text here is really something that's been just copy and pasted from the Bylaws, so that's something that cannot really be changed at this point or at least not very easily.

Then there's the various issues that we think should feature: the working party, the procedures of the working party, the scope of reviews, I mentioned that earlier, the selection process for the independent examiner.   I don't want to go through them all but these are all kind of issues that we think should [inaudible] in and many of them are already in existence. But we need to all pull them together and then see whether amendments or changes then need to be made or whether we can just take on what has been in place so far.

And the same goes for specific reviews. There's a quick introduction of what these reviews are. This is text pulled or redrafted from the Bylaws. And then, the scope of the specific reviews is actually a text that is already featuring the Bylaws. So there's a couple of pages here. I'm just going to show through them.

You see this blue text, it's all been pulled from the Bylaws that kind of sets the scope of the specific reviews. And then, potentially the most critical aspect, which is the selection process of the specific Review Teams and whether the SO and AC Chairs now have a very important role of kind of putting together the Review Team and exercise this previously done by staff.

Something we want to think about are probably eligibility criteria for the Review Team candidates. And then, if you scroll down a little bit further, again, meeting schedules, the agenda setting, questions of attendance, how our research findings and kind of incorporated in the work of the Review Team, what kind of outreach should be done and can be done, and then, what technical issues such as – what kind of administrative tools need to be in place, Adobe Connect rooms, etc., disclosure frameworks. And the report requirements, what should the report of the specific reviews actually look like, what should it contain?

Again, most of these reviews kind of follow a standard procedure and a standard output. We don't think this needs change. It's just something that needs codifying and this is a perfect place for it to kind of appear and so it becomes clear to everybody what the expectations are and what the outcome should be.

Then, finally, another issue that we came up with we think should be included in the reviews is the question of consensus level determination in their specific reviews. And I've kind of [inaudible] copy and pasted the text of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines. So this is something that GNSO uses to determine their consensus level and in fact, those tools are often used already. And I just copied the text in there to kind of give you an idea what could be a starting point for discussion whether that needs to be adapted for the need of the specific reviews is something that we can also talk about. That is really it.

Then there's a couple of appendices we think might be helpful such as acronyms and glossary obviously, best practice resources. And also specific forms, for example, it might be good to have something like a checklist for skill set levels when the SO and AC Chairs make the selection processes and so that the various SO and ACs kind of seek the same skills and diversity issues among the members when they put forward the candidates.

I know this was very brief and quick overview and there's a lot of content in here. But we thought that putting this into one document, I kind of give everybody an idea what this drafting process entails and what the various components are might be very helpful. You probably might want to go away and kind of consult the document first or later. But I think it'd be good to

hear your thoughts on how this should proceed, what kind of mechanisms and discussion should take place, and what framework and what context we should set this.

There's a couple of questions here that I put at the very beginning that are probably most present to those four substantive issues that I talked about earlier especially with regard to the selection process. How to assure diversity in Review Teams? This isn't clear from the Bylaw procedures. How to integrate more newcomers into reviews? Something that Cheryl had talked about in the previous session. And, who should be allowed to propose changes to the operating standards once they are in place, the amendment process is something we probably also need to think through.

So, I won't read through all of them but I think those are potentially good starting points.

You might have been aware that this morning I think that I alluded to this just a second ago, the SSR2 Review Team is in the process of being assembled. And the SO and AC Chairs are currently kind of discussing how they go about that. So one possibility would be, for example, to kind of see what the Chairs come up with for this SSR2, what mechanism they put in place, they will now then consult with their own communities to find out what they think.

And then, see whether that process they applied for the SSR2 whether that can be translated to future Review Teams and whether that's something that can be if you want codified or laid out in these operating standards as moving forward. But that's just one idea and obviously we're open to have suggestions as well.

And with that, I'm going to stop the presentation and look forward to your views and thoughts of what I just said or also if you have anything else to add to the discussion or would like to make any comments, you're very welcome to do so. Thanks, Cheryl, for listening.

FIONA   I have a suggestion on a way for how can we go about this because in the Section 4.6 of the Bylaws that was approved by the Board, we say that the operating standards shall be developed through a community consultation.

I think if we want the ACs and SOs to begin to think about those operating standards and some of the questions you're asking even as we continue the review process, I think it is helpful for us to ask them to also give us, help us create a team.

So we need a team from within the community [inaudible]. We need to go back to now ICANN Finance and find out how that is

going to be supported in terms of the work that needs to go in to put together the operating standards because what you've put together is a good starting of document. But we need to find a way of doing two things at the same time without stopping the review processes that have already begun, developing the operating standards and trying to implement them as we move along.

So we involve the ACs and the SOs in the drafting of the operating standards. I don't know whether that is something that can be fitted in at this point in time because I know that it means there has to be staff support, staff time, and I don't know if the Adobe can handle any more calls because I think it's already so strained with the number of calls happening. The rate at which calls drop – I don't know that we are able to handle having for that and other groups are still engaging. So, that is something that's tough we'd be able to guide on.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Fiona. Yes, absolutely. I think there's three issues. It's community overload, so community has a lot of work on its [inaudible] at the moment. And then, the timing issue as you point out rightly, there's reviews coming up, so it would be good if the operating standards be magically in place already right

now. That would be great. Alas, they're not. And so, how to square that specific circle?

We are hoping to get feedback on, obviously, in the session and the turnout wasn't as good as we hoped because of – as Fiona, you point out previously, there's some scheduling issues that we are aware of, unfortunately.

But I think it would be good to probably reach out to the community after the session. We mentioned the potential for webinar is something similar to kind of make sure that the various reason is [inaudible] fully informed of the status quo and as well as maybe [inaudible] with some feedback for the way forward.

One possibility would be – for example, Fiona, I don't know how you feel about that or what others feel about that. And, those issues that are really just pulling together existing procedures and processes, I put a little slide up here. There's various sources where you can find information and if you want, procedures that are really part of the operating standards or should be part of the operating standards.

And staff could pull something together on those more technical issues to kind of fill the spaces and make the document not as empty as it is right now, and then have the community focus on those issues that are more meaty, if you want, more substantive

such as the nomination procedure, such as the [inaudible] procedure, etc., etc. That is one step forward where we can say the community should really focus their limited work on those areas that matters most.

FIONA: I think that will be very helpful because they need social services, a time of having [inaudible]. The staff can do that and then have it out for public comments, then you're able to now get to the [colleagues] to help flesh it out and fill in any gaps that may be missing or raise questions about parts of those procedures that are not clear.

Because I actually think those procedures may be there. It's just that from [inaudible], it's just that they are not consolidated into one document. So I don't think they'll consolidate them for us and [share them].

LARS HOFFMAN: Luckily, consolidation is actually my middle name, so I could definitely do something like that.

Yeah, absolutely. And as you point out, you have the quote up there at the very beginning. This is what the operating standards say. So we have – staff is very aware that this is – the community plays a very important role in this process. The operating

standards shall be developed through community consultation including public comment opportunities necessary, etc., etc.

I mean, what you suggested would – I think that would potentially be a good way forward. Though I wonder whether we should before we proceed kind of get a little bit more input from a wider community so that we are actually on the right track and we're not just taking this right now and moving forward.

We may have another webinar in a couple of weeks time, take your proposal and see what the community says and then staff could maybe put out a more meaty, if you want, draft document for community input and public comment.

And to be honest, public comment is a probably more effective way to do this thing, creating another working group, another weekly call. I don't know how you feel about that but it seems that – I don't know.

From a personal perspective, streamlining of the process especially with the time we need, the fact that so many [inaudible] are coming up might be a protective way forward.

FIONA: I already dropped the deal of having a group [bring it] when you said you already have the procedures but scattered. So I think we may need to go back to the larger community and ask them

to see… I think if staff already has procedures about going back and that is tough now that new Bylaws, this is the procedures we have, I would like to get your feedback on how to proceed. And that would be a good starting point because then you'd get to know from the community what options of proceeding there are, then it will be up to the community to decide. Because I think the volunteer, they're almost getting exhausted.

LARS HOFFMAN: Yeah, we would obviously also be aware of the issues that definitely will need some input before we put this together. There are some issues as I said that do not feature anywhere. It's such a selection process and I think that we are very aware that there will be different voice in the community with different opinions, and so we don't think that would be our place to decide how that should be done. We think that that should be something that should come from the community. But those as you said process that in place, I think we could consolidate them and put them forward in a relatively short timeframe.

Anybody else who has any?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, here.

LARS HOFFMAN: Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For people who are using Internet with regional languages. In India, we have about 15 official languages. How they can contribute to these operating standards?

LARS HOFFMAN: That's a good question. The documents what we translated and then ICANN at the moment is I think the six UN languages plus Portuguese, so none of the 15 Indian languages unfortunately apart of that. I'm German. It's also not a part of it, so I feel your pain to a degree.

So, I fear that most of the working languages in ICANN is in English. And so, the initial draft will certainly has to be in English. And then, once the procedures are in place and potentially before they go out for a public comment, they could be translated in at least the ICANN languages to kind of make sure that we have the broadest [inaudible] outreach.

But I don't think it will be possible at this stage to translate into more languages beyond that. I mean, this is slightly above my pay grade, so I'm on somewhat thin ice but that is my gut reaction.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Since this is happening in Hyderabad, till the time ICANN 58 happens, do you think in terms of setting up some [inaudible] agency in India to do this?

LARS HOFFMAN: Sorry. I didn't quite get that. Setting up what in India?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A [inaudible] agency who can collect all the information from the regional languages and transfer it and put it to the ICANN directly. I hope I'm clear about what I said.

LARS HOFFMAN: Yes. I'm going to refer to Larisa… Theresa

THERESA: I think maybe an avenue through our engagement contact points for the different regions that would be the right avenue to convey that and we coordinate very, very closely internally across the departments. But that I think would be the right avenue to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Theresa, I think I have a challenge for ICANN and corresponding to the [WACs]. On behalf of this region, the fact that ICANN was able to talk more than to the IDNs, actually means that ICANN has to go the extra mile to the languages in which those IDNs are accommodated. That's a community we are reaching out to, so there has to be special consideration for the language requirements for that community.

I think ICANN needs to look at its internal systems, structures and translation capabilities and see how to accommodate that because it sort of doesn't fit right but you can provide me a domain name in my ethnic, your very local – with me on the domain, on the Internet. But in terms of enabling me have the capacity to understand and to engage, I'm shut out. Just food for thought.

THERESA: It's a really interesting point. So, it's really that in the languages where there is IDN capabilities, whether the organization on the interpretation aspect as far as material goes [inaudible] said, there's actually something – it's an interesting question.

I think we would have to look at that. Right now, we do the translations and availability in the context of the UN languages. If the organization were to go to a broader aspect of this as I think you might be suggesting, that's really something that

would have to come in through the community with regards also to the budgetary process because it has budgetary implications that the community itself approves.

And so, that would have to be something that the community itself raises as something for the organization to consider. And then, for the community itself to approve the budget and operational planning and resource aspects that the organization would need to put into place for that. So, if it's something that the community feels as essential, then we'd need to come through that avenue.

LARS HOFFMAN: And if I can just add, I think that two largest IDNs in terms of top-level domains, I believe are Chinese and Arabic. They are obviously part of the UN languages, so a little bit in the IDN what is already in place with the UN languages. That doesn't mean that couldn't be more done in just like that… in general –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [speaking in foreign language].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm [inaudible]. We are talking about languages, which have a script. But in India, apart from 22 official languages, we have a

large population, like for example, there are certain tribal groups, which number to the tune of 20 million but they do not have a script.

So, I'm not trying to put an [elephant] burden on ICANN but we should also think about creating kind of moral guidance like in their particular language, certain moral guidance as to what is ICANN and what are the various kinds of activities ICANN does and what does ICANN expect from this particular community. That's my suggestion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I also have a small suggestion. To reduce these script issues and like you said, it's about dialects, which doesn't have any script even. All the communication need to be made [inaudible] to one less by text and more by the [inaudible] and pictograms. To some extent, it will improve the situation.

LARS HOFFMAN: I just want to quickly… I think this is very good and helpful input and especially the fact that some communities don't have the script to something that – it's definitely food for thought.

But I just also want to set the expectancy for this specific session where that is – I think it's important aspect once these operating

EN

standards are in place. But the drafting process itself obviously, what this session is specifically about.

And so, I think Theresa alluded to that. We definitely going to take that up to our colleagues who are involved with engagement and I'm thinking for example for the At-Large Community, I think something like oral guidance of how to get involved with ICANN and what it is about is something that is – obviously that is, I don't want to say easily done. But I can imagine how that could be that done during ICANN meeting whereby people with different language skills kind of provide a quick interview of what ICANN is about and that can be posted in the website. I think that's something that we can do not necessarily for this specific topic. But in general, I think that is really good feedback we will take back. Thank you.

All right, unless there's anything else at this point, I get 45 minutes back of my life and so do you. I think what we take away from this if I can quickly summarize this is that we'll produce a quick summary of this session, of the discussion especially about the way forward and we will send that out to the applicable SO and AC lists. We would probably schedule a call or a webinar in the coming weeks to make sure that the outreach is appropriate because of the overlapping sessions, I think the attendance would have been probably slightly larger if there haven't been so many competing session of this very time.

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

Then, we'll make the proposal that Fiona put forward, see how the community reacts and then hopefully, we'll be able to move relatively quickly at least with those aspects that are not as controversial as maybe others.

Larisa, anything to add?

LARISA GURNICK: I just wanted to say thank you for those of you that did make the time for this. I think operating standards will be very important body of work. You remember the slide with so many reviews and that's really a tool for the community participants working on the reviews to make the process easier, consistent and easier to follow.

I really like the suggestion of the pictograms and flowcharts to help not just those that speak different languages but for those that get lost in the very complexity of the reviews, we'll certainly do our best to streamline and to make the information as understandable as possible. So thank you for that feedback.

LARS HOFFMAN: All right, thank you very much and we will see you soon hopefully. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]