

---

ABU DHABI – GAC meeting with ICANN MSSSI Review Team  
Monday, October 30, 2017 – 08:30 to 09:00 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

CHAIR THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Good morning, everyone. We're going to start the first session, any minute. I hope, because we are on a bit of a tight schedule for opening at 9:00 on the ICANN meetings, but I'm awaiting guests. Anyway, a few minutes, hopefully we'll start. Thank you. It's the MSSSI Review Briefing. Thank you.

Okay, I think we'll start. We're on a pretty tight schedule. Thank you everyone for coming at this relatively early hour. The ICANN opening is at 9:00, so we have half an hour for this session, which is an update for us, from the MSSSI Review Team. MSSSI stands for Multi-Stakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives. So, this is the support team for all the reviews that are undertaken—the independent reviews—in particular. So we're talking about the reviews that were established originally by the affirmation of commitments, which was the successor to the original U.S. governmental contract at ICANN—of course, we're going back into history now. And since transition, a number of these reviews have continued and some of them, all of us are quite familiar with—the CCT Review on—I always forget the order—Competition and Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice—the CCT review, which is a look back over the new GTLD round. There are

---

**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.**

---

the other reviews, such as the ones on who is in industry data services, and also the organizational reviews under the framework of accountability and transparency, that was created. So we're talking about the ATIT reviews, in that respect. And also, the security and stability and resiliency of the DNS review—SSR, which has come to problems because the board has written to the team to suspend its work. Perhaps we'll hear a little bit about that from our colleagues from the MSSI Review Team, who I should introduce.

So, to my right, we have Larisa Gurnick, in the middle. On her left is Negar Farzzinnia. And at the far end is Lars Hoffmann. So, without further ado, I will hand over to the first speaker, Larisa. Thanks very much.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much. Good morning. Thank you for having us and thank you for your interest in reviews. So our plan today was to give you a quick overview of what the review program is all about. We also understand that there's particular interest in the accountability and transparency review status and process, and next steps. And also when we talk about specific reviews, the operating standards—the draft operating standards—that have been posted for public comment, that's an important related work that's going on because the operating standards will inform

---

how specific reviews should be conducted, and what the right process and roles and responsibilities are in making sure those reviews come to an effective fruition.

Lars will talk you to about the Cross-Community Standard. We have a session later on this afternoon and we hope you will join us for that. Let's go to the next slide, please, thank you.

The reason we're talking about reviews, and it sounds like you are already pretty informed, is that, as you can see, we have a very busy schedule of review activities. The specific reviews, which came out of the affirmation of commitments—previously we knew them as affirmation of commitment reviews—you can see them on this chart, in blue, and then the other types of reviews, organizational reviews—these are the reviews of the various structures within ICANN. You can see those in sort of the orange color. And then the review cycle, now, under the new bylaws, both types of reviews are now in a five-year cycle. There are some differences in the trigger points, but the important point is that every five years there's a cycle to conduct these reviews. And as you can see here, the process from start to finish, from planning the review all the way to implementing the recommendations that come out of that review process, it's quite lengthy. These, of course, are estimates and forecasts based on information that we have. Okay, next slide, please.

---

Each specific review follows this process. There is a lot of preplanning activities that start even before the review team is assembled. Then the review is initiated and the big new development, under the new bylaws, is that the responsibility has shifted to the community for appointing the review teams, selecting the review teams and appointing the Review Team members, so that's all new. And actually, SSR2 was the first specific review to be done under the new bylaws. So the work to assemble SSR2, I believe, began in October of last year, right after the new bylaws came into effect.

So if you would like more information about sort of the nuts and bolts of what's included in the various steps—obviously we don't have time today—but we do now have a webpage on ICANN.org that talks about all of the processes, what was known as an Hubbub project, that is now posted along with a description to help you understand what is covered in each phase. So if someone could post that link into the Adobe chat, I would appreciate that. Okay, moving on, please.

So, since the new bylaws, since we initiated the SSR2 and RDS who is to review, there's been some observed issues. I have posted some issues here to consider some of the observed issues by ICANN community, by the board, by the ICANN organization, myself, my team—who provide the support to the various

---

reviews. So if in a kind of very high-level, some of the areas that have been brought up as concerns is the whole process of selection of review teams. There are unclear checks and balances over skills and diversity. The bylaws specifically highlight the fact that making sure that the review teams are balanced for skills and diversity that falls to the community and specifically the SO/AC chairs to do that. We've also observed that it's difficult for people to apply and participate in the review process when it's not known to them exactly what that might entail. So, because there is not clarity around setting the scope, and the review teams, so far, have been left to clarify and determine their own scope, we've had a lot of indications from different community members that that poses a challenge for some. Not knowing what they're signing up for, how long it will take and such.

That feeds into scope of work, determining what the scope for the review would be. There's some indications that doing that ahead of the start of the review might be helpful. And, of course, you already saw from the [Inaudible 00:09:22] chart, we have a lot of simultaneous reviews and that's all hard-coded into the bylaws. So we have no control over the timing of reviews, but that's certainly community and volunteer bandwidth and the ability to run effectively all these reviews at the same time. That's definitely been one of the issues. Finally, unclear expectations. Everybody understands the importance of reviews as an important

---

accountability mechanism, but what exactly should the outcome be, and how should the effectiveness of reviews be measured? There's not a clarity around that.

So with this, let's go to the ATRT3 slide. I'd like to start there because I understand there's some interest on where this is and how the process is supposed to work. So the call for volunteers was initiated all the way back in January of this year, because there was not a lot of response to the call, the call was extended. And at this point, based on the process, based on the process that has been followed for SSR2 and RDS, the applications have been forwarded to their representative SOs and ACs for them to go through their own selection—evaluation and selection process—and then they nominate candidates, each of the organizations nominates candidates and then it moves over to the SO/AC chairs for them to actually appoint the review team. To date, we've had the GNSO submit their nominations. They did that just recently, about a month ago, and then the RSSAC also went through this process and did that earlier in the summer, in July. So, to date, we have nominees from two of the SOs and ACs and that's the status. So, we're waiting for others to complete their internal procedures, and also encourage the SOs and ACs and their leadership to consider draft-operating standards, as well as the reviews that are currently underway to see if that might inform

---

what the next step will be with ATRT3. Are there any questions about this topic before I move on?

CHAIR THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yes, sorry, just a comment from me. As a member of the GAC Leadership Team, one of the issues for us has been not being familiar with one of the nominations. Is this team the STRT?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes.

CHAIR THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yes, yeah. So that causes a bit of a problem. We are one of the ACs still waiting to get back you on this, we'll be conscious of that, but one of the issues was that we just didn't know who the guy was. Anyway, that was one of the new factors because, previously, it was per our chair, working with the chair of the board to identify people, but it's a different process now. Anyway, I just mentioned that. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, that's a very useful observation and actually something that we heard from many different communities. So as part of the call for volunteers and the instructions and the follow-

---

up that might team does to ensure that we reach out to the most diverse and skilled group of people that would be interested in doing this work. In that effort, we encourage them to build a relationship and establish a connection with those SOs and ACs, whoever they feel they would like to be nominated by. But it is, indeed, a challenge and that's actually something that we continue to discuss and hope to expand and incorporate into the operating standards, the ability to clarify this area.

All right, in the interest of time, let's just go to the next slide, please. One more. Oh, okay. I guess we've taken out our standard slides. One more. The CCT slides, please. Fantastic.

Okay, and we will, of course, leave you with these slides, but I wanted to walk you through the kind of information we have available, as part of the update on what's happening with the review, so you'll see this for all three specific reviews. There's a timeline. We also publish a fact sheet on a quarterly basis. And here is an example of what that looks like, so for those of you that are interested in knowing the status and progress of work of each of the review teams, these are published on a quarterly basis, so we expect to have the September 30 version, actually updated and posted right after ICANN 60. That's going to include financial information through the end of September and all of the milestones and accomplishments, as well. And this information



---

is available on the Wiki. But we do track here the facts that we capture for each of the review teams is, the level of participation of review team members, the hours contributed in meetings—face-to-face meetings and calls and such—and also the amount of money from the budgetary perspective of the budget that got allocated to the review team, where they are in terms of expenditures and, of course, the most substantive part is the accomplishment of milestones, based on the work plans. So, you can see that consistent information for all of the reviews.

I know in the introduction there was a mention about SSR2. Actually, I think this was the time slot that originally you were planning to spend talking to the SSR2 Review Team, so I'm not quite sure what the changes in scheduling were, but my understanding was that you had an interest in getting a full update on all the reviews, which is why this team is here. SSR2 team is actually here. They are having a lot of engagement sessions with the community, and I'm sure they would be very happy to spend some time—should you have an opening in your schedule—to speak with you. And I will acknowledge that the board letter that you referenced, and at this point if you have any thoughts or questions about that, please direct it to the board. Well, before I move on to organizational reviews, questions on this?

---

CHAIR THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Are there questions? Okay, I think we can proceed.

LARISA GURNICK: Moving on, I'll pass it to Lars. Lars, quick update on operating standards.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Larisa. Yeah, we kind of skipped through the organizational reviews, so I'll give you a two-second overview here. We have, at the moment, seven organizational reviews that effect all of them in various stages. I'll be very happy to answer any of these questions for implementation stage from GNSO to the planning stage of the ccNSO that will start next year. And ongoing here, during this meeting especially, are the RSSAC and the NomCom review. I'll put a little plug in here, if I may, if I can encourage you to take part in the NomCom survey, that would be very much appreciated. I will make sure to post that into the chat.

The slide here is the operating standard. Now shifting gear a little bit. They pertain to the specific reviews that Larisa just talked about. They are basically the document – first of all, they are out for public comment at the moment. And they are trying to achieve three different things really. One is to fulfill the bylaw

---

requirements, so the operating standards mentioned in the current bylaws. The bylaws encourage the operating standards to elaborate on things such as the decision-making procedures of review teams, also the selection process of the review teams, within certain bylaw mandated boundaries.

In addition to that, they collate best practices. So AOC reviews, those have been going on for a long time, so the institutional knowledge that has not been codified, we have brought together here both from staff and from the community, and various engagement sessions, you can see here on the slide in front of you. Then the third purpose of the operating standards is to address any issues or concerns that have arisen from the current reviews that have been started on the venue bylaws, which obviously as you know, the SSR2 review. So there's areas such as the selection of the review team members to make sure the team is selected with the right skill set and representing the diversity requirements that we all expect within ICANN. And also, the scope-setting procedure, as well as issues such as resignation of review team members, so everyone knows what to expect should such an event occur. And I think we can go two slides on. One more please, actually.

We can go to the participation session, ICANN 60. The second down here is the cross-community session this afternoon, at

---

quarter past 3:00. I believe it's next door in Hall 4, where we have will have a session on the operating standards for the specific reviews, to give a more detailed introduction, obviously, and to encourage everybody to comment, provide their input and their views, and hopefully also prepare submission to the public comment forum that will remain open until the 15th of January. So it will be a 90-day expended period for that. And then pass it on.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes.

CHAIR THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Lars. For the benefit of newcomers, just going back to the organizational reviews, that set of reviews does not include the GAC because it's in the bylaws—I think it says that the GAC will conduct its own internal reviews, so unlike the other ACs and SOs, our work and how we work and whether we forget our objectives and so on, is not reviewed in this same way. I thought I would just explain that. And I just have a quick question. The outcome of these organizational reviews, what's the process for implementing recommendations for any changes or corrections if that's necessary? Just very briefly, what is the process?

---

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, thank you. Very good question. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board is charged with responsibility to oversee that review process and make sure that the reviews are conducted in a manner that provides impact and helps continuous improvements. So, specific to each review, the process is when the independent examiner issues their final recommendations, there's also the community under review has the opportunity to weigh in on the recommendations and weigh in on the feasibility and advisability, and a way forward to implement those, and submits that to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. Based on all that, and the input from public comments, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee makes a recommendation to the board on what to do with the recommendations. And then ultimately the board takes action to adopt recommendations—or not—in cases where they don't feel that's appropriate. And then based on that, it moves into the implementation phase. So as Lars mentioned, the GNSO is in that phase. They are implementing board-adopted implementations from their second review. And ALAC At Large is moving toward that place. But the board has not taken action. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee is working through analyzing the recommendations and the feedback from the community.

---

But overall, as a review program, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, on a basis, reflects with us and the community on lessons learned, and what worked well during the review process and what didn't. So that it informs the way we update our internal processes and procedures to be applicable to future organizational reviews. I know we're out of time, but I would be happy to discuss more on that next time we have a chance to gather, or I would be happy to do follow up answers if there's questions.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Yes, please go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: Actually, that's it, we will leave you with the slide that's on—

LARS HOFFMANN: Can I just add one quick sure?

LARISA GURNICK: Sure.

---

LARS HOFFMAN: One quick thing, on the operating standards, for those who maybe won't be able to make it to the session later, we had a very fruitful discussion yesterday with the CCSO who asked, specifically, for us to connect with them after ICANN 60, through a webinar or maybe just a working group call within the CCSO, to walk through them the specific teams within the document to help them prepare the public comments. If that is something that GAC may be interested in, we are very open to that. Obviously, if you don't think it's appropriate, that's fine as well, we just want to make that offer.

CHAIR THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thanks very much, Lars, we'll certainly note that and we'll have a discussion, I guess, initially, in the GAC leadership and then consult with colleagues. So that's the end of the presentation? Excellent. Thanks very much for running through this.

Does anybody have a final question? We have about two minutes before we need to head to the opening ceremony. I don't see any hands raised. So that leaves me to thank you very much, Lars and Negar for coming. It's very informative, very comprehensive presentations and we will look at the slide sets and we'll follow up on the points you have raised that are of particular interest to us. Thank you very much, indeed.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**