EN

COPENHAGEN – ICANN Review Operating Standards: Next Steps
Monday, March 13, 2017 – 13:45 to 15:00 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

LARS HOFFMAN: The specific reviews, so the researchers – the SSR Review and the CCT Review, they are now also mandated by the Bylaws that used to be an AoC Reviews because they fell under the AoC before the IANA Transition was completed.

And so, the Bylaws called for the operating centers to be drafted. There was a call for community collaboration to take place in the drafting process. And we hope when they will finish, there's going to be a system or a document for efficient and effective reviews that summarize best practices especially for organizational reviews and then, also layout any new processes as they pertain to specific reviews especially to those points, I will talk to them later, that under the post-IANA Transition Bylaws.

The [inaudible] below gives a quick overview what has happened to date and where we're going from here on out and we set up some informative discussions back in Helsinki. We had a committee session in Hyderabad where we proposed a

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.

skeleton draft that is still up on the wiki page. We also have links to the wiki page, etc.

Then in February this year, we had a webinar to given update and we're here now at ICANN 58. In the next steps – and I will talk to that a little bit later as well – we're going to formalize hopefully the community consultation and then eventually end up at the very rights and publish a draft document that then will go at the public comment obviously.

So, the Review Operating Standards for Organizational Reviews, I spoke to that or we spoke to that briefly on the webinar as well and we are in the process of putting together a strawman. And, the reason we do that, we set up for the strawman because the organizational reviews really the language and the Bylaws has not really changed since with the transition. These reviews always fell under Bylaws and they have been ran for a long time and this is a lot of established best practices that are in place.

In the doc, the operating standards [inaudible] place will be kind of want to formalize them and bring them together and to obviously want to refine them with the help of community input. But there's nothing really new to this process, so we thought that the best way forward is here to give the community the status quo and then see how we together we can potentially improve the process even further.

We expected the strawman will go out shortly after 58 and obviously, we'll inform the community of the publication and also provide instructions of how to get feedback and how to engage in the aforementioned refinement process.

So, the specific reviews, as I said, not to be confusing, this is the same document and if you want to imagine a future document, part one will pertain to organizational reviews and part two will pertain to the specific reviews, and this part two under specific reviews that the operating standards must certainly will require some community input before we are at any sort of drafting stage.

Just for anybody to get some clarification. I alluded to this earlier. The specific reviews are these four that you can see here: the Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3). For anybody in the room, that's the session on this actually right after in Hall A3. You are very much welcome and encouraged to attend, and for some of you, it might be even compulsory. The Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review, the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review and obviously, the Registration Data Services Review, formerly known/better known as WHOIS.

So these four reviews now fall as I said under the Bylaws and they also provide new processes and new powers that weren't

there before when they fell under the AoC. And so, there are some specific questions, some call them big ticket items that require the development of new processes and that should eventually be documented in the operating standards.

The specific questions here, the first five bullet points that I think we will focus the committee outreach that I will talk to you a little bit later. This is the selection process for the review teams.

The decision-making process, so once they are in place, what is actually the way and how are they going to make decisions? And, the Bylaws also provide for observers to attend these teams but they don't provide any information of what are the exact role and responsibility for observers? So, it will be good to kind of have a common understanding of what their role would be.

The scope of the review – if you look at the operating standards at the Bylaws, they provide guidelines of what the review team may look at and these guidelines are quite extensive. But you might have noticed the operative word which is "may," which obviously opens the door for the review team to look it more or less of those either more exactly those or even fewer items that are mentioned in the Bylaws. And so, it would be good to establish all the procedure of how the review or how the scope of the review is exactly set, what may or may not be the role of

SO and ACs in that process, and probably what timeline the scope of the review should be set.

When all this is set and done looking even further ahead, once these operating procedures are in place, how we actually are going to amend them? That's also an issue that I think would be useful to think about just because I think as we may all try, chances are we will come across items that may refresh or changes due to us realizing that there are even better practices out there or that maybe we've gotten wrong in some areas. And so, how are we going to then fix those once they are in place?

In this specific issue, the next steps – what we're going to do here is we're planning to send out the letter to the SO and ACs, as well as the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. And for those of you who are part or have taken part in GNSO PDP Working Groups, it's a practice that is quite common there. At the beginning, there's often a call for inputs to the SO and ACs. It's not a formal public comment period. It's rather just an idea to kind of see where the various parts of the community stand and what's the viewpoints are. And so, we're going to hopefully send this out with questions pertaining to these five issues that are up here on top.

From those views or from those answers, we will then hope to draw together a strawman specifically on these five areas and

while we can all hope that all seven SO and ACs, and all nine Stakeholder Group and Constituencies, all express the exact same opinion. There is a slight chance. Obviously, there might be some divergence.

And so, rather than for staff to present or make a decision which views are more valid than others, I think the strawman as we [envision] at the moment should kind of portray this that not show the converging views on the areas but also lay out options especially in those areas where there's clear divergence between the communities. And that strawman as a whole, then as a whole document can be put up for public comment to kind of potentially go beyond the SO and ACs, and to see once everybody sees what the others are thinking to get some feedback and hopefully through that process arrive at the consensus outcome and have some operating standards on specific reviews ready to go.

And with that somewhat speedy presentation I realize, we've come to the fun part, which is questions and answers. Any questions?

You do. Just go ahead.

RAFAEL LITO IBARRA: Yeah. Thank you. This is Lito Ibarra. Are we expecting or anticipating just one set of operating standard for all of the specific reviews or we're going to have different?

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Lito. Yes, absolutely. The operating standards pertaining to specific reviews will cover the process for all four of these specific reviews, absolutely.

I mean, having said that, if through the consultation process, we see that maybe for one of the teams for a reason that we don't foresee at the moment, there needs to be a difference of any procedures. I mean, I don't want to speak out of [inaudible] but I don't see an issue why that couldn't be taken of consideration.

But as we have thought through this at the moment, we believe that the same document would be able to serve all four specific reviews. And the same incidentally will go to the organizational reviews obviously. They will also cover that.

In the organizational reviews, I like to add the caveat that for example the review working parties by the communities on the review. And, from our perspective it's, for example, very important, there is definitely a decentralized process. So, while the operating standards would encourage these review working parties to be formed, the way how they are run, the number of

members, what the leadership roles and responsibilities are within those two working parties would be definitely something that we would decentralize to the At-Large, to the communities under the At-Large, the GNSO. We don't feel it's appropriate for the operating standards to dictate how these communities want to organize themselves in supporting these organizational reviews. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: To add to Lars comment, we feel and I think the community feels the same way that having a standard that applies to the whole program of reviews be the specific reviews or organizational reviews will bring some predictability, consistency and hopefully make the work of the review teams and the community that participates in this process easier, and more transparent as well. So, that's another reason for standardizing hence toward standards.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And, I agree with that but I was thinking about the scope issue. Scope may include different things. So, that's my question.

LARS HOFFMAN: No, absolutely. So, the scope is actually – the Bylaws prescribe already areas of scope that the review teams may address and

they are different for each review specifically for each of, I should say, individual list for each of the specific reviews.

What the operating standards I think will look at is once the review team is formed, how do they decide what aspects or what some areas of these listed scopes in the Bylaws are going to address and are there going to be additional ones or are there going to be few of them that was listed.

And I think that process of – how that is being decided regardless of what the subject actually is is probably pertains to all four if they're in the same way if that makes sense.

Any other questions by anyone? I'm looking around. Well, this is probably the fastest hour and a half I've ever spent.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's no one online either.

LARS HOFFMAN: That's right. Sorry [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

LARS HOFFMAN: Well, if there are no further questions, what we'll do is we will go back into our little operating standards world. We'll draft the letter that will be sent out to the SO and ACs with those questions. We will also post in due time the strawman on the operating standards as it pertain to organizational reviews. And then hopefully, we will be able in the Johannesburg to present at the very least an overview of the views of the community on those five questions, as well as any reactions that we receive on the organizational reviews.

Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: So, obviously, the schedule is challenging at the ICANN meeting, so I just want to acknowledge the fact that despite a topic that is probably relevant to many where seeing the challenges of scheduling at an ICANN meeting. So, what we plan to do around that is just to continue the outreach to the different channels. This is obviously just one way to disseminate the information but we'll continue to use all the different channels to continue to inform the community of what's happening through newsletters, blogs, other means of getting this information out so that people are aware of how this is progressing and opportunities to participate and get them all.

LARS HOFFMAN: Last chance, otherwise, you can end the recording.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]