EN

ICANN70 | Prep Week – Status Update on ICANN Review and Implementation
Wednesday, March 10, 2021 – 14:30 to 16:00 EST

PAMELA SMITH:

I'll be monitoring the chat room along with Yvette Guigneaux. In this role, I am the voice for the remote participants, ensuring that they are heard equally with those who are in-room participants. When submitting a question that you want me to read out loud on the microphone in this session, please provide your name and affiliation if you're representing one, and start your sentence with the word <QUESTION> surrounded by carets and end it with the word <QUESTION> surrounded by carets.

When submitting a comment that you want me to read out loud on the microphone, once again, provide your name, the affiliation if you have one, and start your sentence with the word <COMMENT> surrounded by carets and end it with <COMMENT> surrounded by carets.

Text outside of these quotes will be considered as part of the regular chat and will not be read out loud on the mic. Any questions or comments provided outside of the session time will not be read aloud. Please note that audio may be available in other UN languages.

All chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior which I will post in the chat.

Thank you so much. And with that, I hand it off to Teresa.

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.

THERESA SWINEHART: Wonderful. Thank you, everybody, and welcome. And welcome to the prep week webinars. We're excited to be able to give you this presentation around the ICANN reviews and an update around the implementation area.

As you know, reviews are an important part of our accountability mechanism and continuous improvements. And we have quite a few reviews going on, many of which have spanned several years or do span several years both for the conducting of the review itself and then, of course, the implementation of the recommendations in allowing for time to see whether the recommendations address the issues that have been arising.

It's important to take a comprehensive view on reviews. We refer to it as the life cycle, in a sense, from the time that it's operationalized until it's implemented in order to take a look at the improvement areas. And here, we want to update you want some recent changes to enhancing our support in this important area with some of the division of work that you'll see with the partnership with Xavier and his team with regards to implementation.

On this webinar you're going to hear about the status of the reviews, the progress on the implementation of the recommendations including those from the CCWG Work Stream 2 and the status of the evolution of the multistakeholder model.

So with that, can I ask you to go to the next slide?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Teresa, somehow you got muted [really quickly], so let's get you unmuted.

THERESA SWINEHART: Let's see. Let's do that.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: You are unmuted.

THERESA SWINEHART: There we go. Yes, these mute buttons. So, here you see the agenda. Obviously, the Welcome and Introduction here. And with Xavier, we'll be covering this in the different teams. We'll be looking at the status of the specific reviews, the status of the organizational reviews, as we mentioned, the cross-community working group. And then questions and answers.

So, with that I am going to turn it over to Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Teresa. Can we have the next slide, please?

So, Teresa was just pointing out the life cycle of reviews, and you have a diagram representation of this here. And I want to emphasize that this is the life cycle that is really driven by its purpose to drive improvements to ICANN as Teresa was saying earlier. And this ultimate objective is obviously achieved if every single step of that cycle is being completed.

Any given step, on its own, is not sufficient. All the steps need to be completed.

Another way to put this is we're all in this together. We all need to work together to be able to achieve that objective. And the cycle starts effectively with—at the bottom right of this diagram—the community-led reviews. There's no improvement if there's not a set of volunteers that come together and identify and make recommendations which are then—if you go towards the left of the diagram at the bottom—received by the Board and acted upon by the Board to adopt the recommendations, creating therefore a need for, then, a prioritization to occur and ensuring that the adopted recommendations or being prioritized for the implementation.

And once prioritized, then the planning for the implementation starts which is all the checklists that help ensure that we can actually implement the recommendations. Do we have the resources? Do we have the time? Do we have the funding? All those requirements need to be met, and then we proceed with the implementation at the end of the which—implementation—we need to ensure we understand that the improvements that were conceived, that were desired at the beginning of the process with the recommendations, have actually been achieved by the implementation of the recommendations that have been made.

And that's the end of the cycle. And, of course, it is a cycle because after that, given the review has been completed—the recommendations implemented and the recommendations being measured in terms of their effectiveness—there will be, later on, another review happening

that will, among its work, check that effectively those improvements have benefited ICANN in its operations and its stakeholders. Next slide, please.

So, as Teresa was saying, within the organization we are now organized in two teams that complement each other. The team that many of you have seen in the past and known is the one that supports the review team in the work of carrying out the review itself. It supports the inception of the review. It supports the team members of the review, the volunteers that participate to the review team—supports their work with the logistics, with content, with guidance during that review time.

And we have a recently, or last year, implemented a new team which is the Implementation Operations Team which takes on the role of implementation once the Board has adopted the recommendation. So, the recommendation moves from being just a recommendation [in] a report, and becomes an action plan to be implemented. So, that new team is a team that is focusing on taking on the adopted recommendations and implementing them to ensure that the desired outcome of those recommendations is put into effect and is achieved.

So, those two teams together, combined, support the end-to-end life cycle of the reviews. And I want to emphasize that those two teams work in an integrated fashion. What I mean by that is, the review and support and accountability team supports the review team while it works to produce recommendations. In the background, the Implementation Operations Team is also going to help that process [by] providing advice, for example, or feasibility assessments to the review

team to help those recommendations in being shaped in a fashion that leads them to being able to be implemented down the road.

On the other hand, while we're in implementation, the Implementation Operations Team has the lead, but the review and support team is there to help, to provide background, to provide history sometimes, to provide input on what conversations occurred during the review which are, of course, very often a very helpful background in order to better understand how to implement the recommendation.

And that's how those two teams work together. Both teams and their members are very familiar with the entire life cycle of the reviews from beginning to end, very familiar with the status of each of the various reviews, and can speak to any of those at any one time. Next slide, please.

To focus a little bit more on the implementation and the prioritization of reviews and recommendations. There are obviously a lot of recommendations that are currently in the pipeline coming from specific reviews, but also coming from cross-community working groups. To mention just two, we have, of course, the Work Stream 2 Accountability recommendations that are in process of implementation. Another example is the Auction Proceeds Report which is not yet in implementation mode, but has been submitted to the Board.

These along with all the specific reviews—whether you mention CCT, RDS, ATRT3, etc.—form a large number of recommendations in the 215 or so—we'll see more about that later on—recommendations which

illustrates the point that we need to organize together how we go about implementing those recommendations.

There are many connections between these various reviews and their recommendations. There are sometimes dependencies, sometimes overlap between the topics that are being touched on with those recommendations. And, of course, these connections need to be taken into account from an implementation standpoint.

So, prioritizing the work is important to ensure that when there is a sequential approach needed, it is correctly evaluated and put in place. There are also bandwidth requirements or constraints that apply to all of us that also need to be taken into account, leading to the need to prioritize.

With that, I will go to the next slide, please. And I'll pass it on to Jennifer who will provide us a status of the specific reviews.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks so much, Xavier. So, if we can move to the next slide, please. Thank you.

I'm going to provide an update on the status of the second Security, Stability and Resiliency Review, otherwise known as SSR2. So, the SSR2 is one of ICANN's four specific reviews which are mandated by ICANN's bylaws. Previously, they were part of the Affirmation of Commitments. Specific reviews are so called because they look at specific topics. In this case, how ICANN meets its security, stability, and resilience commitments.

Specific reviews are conducted by review teams of community volunteers who deliver findings and recommendations to the ICANN Board in the form of a final report. So in this case, the SSR2 Review Team submitted its final report to the Board on the 25th of January of this year, 2021. This final report was a combination of several years of work by a review team of community volunteers.

The final report contains 63 recommendations which are grouped into four areas. So, the first area is the implementation of the 28 recommendations from the first SSR Review, otherwise known as SSR1, and the intended effects of implementation of those recommendations. The second area focuses on key stability issues within ICANN. The third area is contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS abuse. And then finally, additional security, stability, and resilience-related concerns regarding the global DNS.

So, as part of the standard process for specific reviews, the final report is published for public comment to inform Board action. So, in this case and the public comment period is open for several more weeks. It closes on the 8th of April. It was actually extended from the original close date in March in response to a request from the community for more time to submit public comments. So, the public comment proceeding is an important part of the process. It's an opportunity for you, the ICANN community, and other stakeholders to provide input and feedback to inform the Board's consideration.

The review team has actually concluded its work, so the published recommendations are final. They cannot be modified at this stage, but

implementation shepherds are available to provide clarifications. And I'll speak a little bit more to implementation shepherds on the next slide.

I would encourage you to read the final report and submit comments to the proceeding if you're interested in this area. And again, the feedback is to inform the Board's consideration, and it's not for the SSR2 Review Team to make adjustments to the report at this stage.

Another resource for you to take a look at is the webinar. The SSR2 Review Team hosted a webinar on its final report in February of this year, so you can access the recording to that webinar online via the link on the site. And I believe my colleague will pop it into the chat there for you as well.

So, per the bylaws the Board has six months to take action on the SSR2 Final Report, so that will be by the 25th of July this year. So, if we could move to the next slide, please.

What to expect in terms of next steps in the typical process for specific reviews. So, the Board will consider the public comments received as well as an ICANN Org-produced feasibility analysis of the impact of the implementation of the recommendations. So, that piece of work will take into account the initial cost and resource estimates and dependencies with other ongoing work within the community as well.

So, they implementation shepherds are available to provide clarifications, as I mentioned before. So, implementation shepherds are actually former members of the SSR2 Review Team who

volunteered to take on this role. So, they have to act on the proceedings of the SSR2 Review Team. They cannot change the intent of the recommendations, but they are available to answer questions that the Board or the Org or, in fact, even the community might have in terms of looking for some clarity on the recommendations. You can find out more about who those people are and their role on the Wiki page.

So, again, in terms of the process for any recommendations that the Board approves, the Board is expected to direct implementation of the recommendations subject to planning, scheduling, and prioritization. As stipulated in the bylaws, for any recommendations that the Board does not approve, the Board is required to provide written rationale for that action. As you know, the Board typically provides a detailed justification for any of its actions in the Board resolutions.

So with that, thank you for your time. I'm going to hand the baton, I believe, to Negar. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Jennifer. Hello, everyone. My name is Negar Farzinnia. I'm a member of the Implementation Operations Team here at ICANN Org, and I will be providing you with [an] update on the status of some of the specific reviews today. Could we go to the next slide, please? Thank you.

So, the first review that I will provide an update on is the Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review, or as we call it for ease of reference, CCT. As you may recall during ICANN69, the Board took

action and approved 11 pending recommendations. That brings us to a total of 17 recommendations that have now been accepted. Of these 17 recommendations, a number of them are currently in implementation and/or are nearing implementation work.

So, we are developing a more frequent and detailed reporting mechanism to be able to provide updates to the community as we continue to make progress towards implementing these accepted recommendations. And this, of course, is in addition to the annual review implementation reports that ICANN Org produces as per our bylaws to report on the progress updates on the reviews and the implementation of these recommendations on an annual basis.

We have a small number of these accepted recommendations that do have dependencies either on the outcome and/or completion of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group's work and/or continuation of resolution of community discussions around DNS abuse studies. And so, we are monitoring these projects quite closely and the discussions that are taking place within the community to make sure that we can take action in addressing these accepted recommendations as those dependencies resolve.

For the remaining accepted recommendations, we have a lot of work ahead of us. We are in the implementation planning phase for those recommendations and are currently working to identify any dependencies, high-level action item requirements, budget and resource needs so that we can properly plan for allocation of funds and resources for the implementation of this work.

As you may also recall, we have still a number of pending recommendation. Six to be exact. We've been a lot of progress towards addressing the Board requests on these pending recommendations. Some of these pending recommendations do have dependencies that we are waiting to resolve as part of community discussions. However, we will continue to work on them to address any remaining open items and allow the Board to reconsider these recommendations when they're ready for their consideration.

And, of course, the CCT Final Report had a number of recommendations assigned either in whole or in part to various parts of the community to address. These recommendations were passed through to the relevant community [groups] for consideration. And ICANN Org continues to monitor the progress that the community is making towards addressing these recommendations as updates become available. Next slide, please. Thank you.

The next review I would like to provide an update on is the Registration Directory Service Review, or RDS in short. There were a total of 15 recommendations that the Board accepted, and a number of these recommendations either have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. And again, as I said before, we will be providing periodic reporting to the community as we continue to make progress towards implementation of these recommendations so that everyone's aware of how the work is progressing.

There's a small number of these accepted recommendations that do have dependencies on ongoing work; for example, on the outcome of

the EPDP Phase 2 which we also continue to monitor closely so that we can take action on these recommendations when the dependencies have been resolved.

For the remaining accepted recommendations, some implementation work is already underway, as I noted before. For example, some recommendations are part of the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation. And for the remaining accepted recommendations, similarly to the CCT Review, we've initiated an implementation planning phase and are working towards identifying budget and resource requirements, dependencies, high-level action requirements, and more detailed information that will allow us to get this work ready for planning purposes for the allocation of funds and resources to start implementation work on them.

And, of course, there are a small number of recommendations that are in the pending status for the RDS Review, and these recommendations have dependencies on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 topics. The Board will consider these recommendations after evaluating the outcomes of the EPDP Phase 2 to move them forward for their consideration.

And, lastly, there is one recommendation that was passed through to another part of the community for addressing, and of course we are monitoring the progress that is made towards addressing this recommendation and will provide updates as they become available. Next slide, please. Thank you.

The last specific review that I want to provide an update on is the third Accountability and Transparency Review. As you may recall, the Board

took action on the final recommendations of ATRT3 on November 30, 2020, and accepted five recommendations that were contained in the final report.

We are currently in the process of carrying out a preliminary evaluation of the potential work that's associated with the implementation of these recommendations so that we can evaluate the priority and the associated workload in the upcoming prioritization exercise of the ICANN work. Of course, some accepted recommendations are already in the process of being implemented; namely, the recommendation that pertains to the prioritization of community recommendations is part of a more comprehensive planning and prioritization process that has been established out ICANN order to help manage the overall ICANN Org workload.

And with this, let me pass it on to my colleague, Larisa Gurnick, to provide you with an update on the status of the organizational reviews.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much, Negar. Hello, everybody. Welcome to this webinar. Organizational reviews are an important part of ICANN's accountability and are critical to maintaining a healthy multistakeholder model. These reviews are required by the bylaws and take place on a five-year cycle that's based on feasibility.

Organizational reviews are conducted by independent examiners, and they assess several areas. First, it's whether the organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure. Secondly, it's whether any

change in the structure or operations is desirable to improve effectiveness. And finally, whether an organization is accountable to its constituencies and stakeholder groups.

As you will see from the following update, the reviews of the different structures are in various phases with most moving toward completion of the second round of reviews. This is certainly the culmination of a great deal of diligent work by the structures that go through these reviews and importantly conduct the implementation of improvements. Next slide, please.

Okay. We'll go through the various reviews, and these are in alphabetical order by the name of the structure in case you were wondering.

So, first up is the At-Large Review which really completed its implementation some time ago. ICANN Board accepted the final implementation report in September of 2020, and that brought to conclusion that second review of the At-Large organization.

While the bulk of implementation work had been completed, there were two remaining components of implementation that were either ongoing or outside of the control of the At-Large. And these remaining components which pertain to member engagement and criteria, and absence of consistent performance metrics are undergoing still.

The ALAC Review Implementation Working Group provided a status update in December, and the next update is expected in June of 2021. And that's just in the minor remaining components.

Moving on to the review of the ccNSO. This review is in Board consideration phase. The second review of the ccNSO happens to be the last review in the second round of organizational reviews. So, that's noteworthy.

The independent examiner presented its final report, findings, and recommendations to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board in August, and the ccNSO Review Working Party presented their Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan at the same time.

The OEC requested some clarification and additional information, and the ccNSO provided that additional information to the OEC just recently at the end of February. So, the OEC will take this information into consideration, along with the final report from the independent examiner and the feasibility assessment prepared by the ccNSO. And this will take place in preparation for Board action on the final report and the feasibility assessment plan with the timing to be determined after ICANN70. Next slide, please. Thank you.

Moving on to the GNSO. GNSO was actually one of the first reviews to go through the second round of reviews, and it had actually been completed for quite a while. So, the reason we're talking about this right now is just to give you an update on the various discussions that have been underway about the timing of the next review.

The third cycle of organizational reviews would be due to begin with the GNSO in June of 2021, and that's based on the current bylaws specifications and the fact that the Board took action on the final report

of the second GNSO Review back in June of 2016. Therefore, five years later would put us to June of 2021.

ATRT recommendation and organizational reviews and the related Board action is expected to have impact on the timing and the nature of the next round of organizational reviews as ATRT recommended to evolve the content of organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program for each SO, AC, and the NomCom.

The Board had approved ATRT3 recommendations, as Negar indicated, in November of 2020, and directed some specific activities as are indicated in the Board resolution and the scorecard.

The Board had reached out to the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as the GNSO Council, to invite their views on the timing of the next GNSO Review. And the responses came in from a number of groups, including the Commercial Stakeholders Group, registries, registrars, and the GNSO Council indicating general agreement to defer the third GNSO Review, given considerations of ATRT3 and other factors.

At the request of the Commercial Stakeholders Group, a meeting with the OEC will be planned after ICANN70 to discuss this matter in the context of the Board approved ATRT3 recommendation. And the OEC is expected to have further discussions around this point as well.

Next up is the review of the NomCom which is currently in the implementation phase. Because of the unique nature of the NomCom, the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group plays a unique

role in the implementation of the review recommendations as compared to the way things work for other SOs and ACs where implementation work typically conducted by a group of members from that particular structure or organization and then approved by the leadership of a given organization.

Since the delegates appointed to the NomCom change annually, the Review Implementation Working Group takes on the responsibility of implementing the recommendations as there is really no other entity that could be tasked with that work.

The Review Implementation Working Group is comprised of volunteers from various community groups. NomCom Review Implementation Working Group provided a detailed status update and progress report on their implementation earlier today. Feel free to check out that recorded section. And if one of my colleagues could post a link to make that easier for you, I'd appreciate that greatly. Next slide, please.

And this is the last update we have. For the RSSAC where the review is in the implementation phase with the second progress report provided in December of 2020, of the total six recommendations, the implementation has been completed for two. Two more are in progress, and two recommendations have not been started yet that were being dependent on the progress of Root Server System Governance Working Group.

And last but not least, the review of the SSAC. The implementation has been completed just recently. The SSAC had provided their final implementation report to the OEC in December. All 24

recommendations accepted by the Board have either been completed or integrated into ongoing SSAC processes as documented in the SSAC Operational Procedures. The ICANN Board is expected to take action on this matter at its upcoming Board meeting in March.

And that concludes our update on organizational reviews. And now I'm pleased to introduce Alice Jansen who will provide an update on implementation of Work Stream 2. Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you very much, Larisa. Hello, everyone. My name is Alice Jansen, and I'm a member of the Implementation Operations Function. Today I will provide you an update on the Work Stream 2 Implementation project. If we could go to the next slide, please. Thank you very much.

So, some background information to start. At the conclusion of the IANA Stewardship Transition in 2016, the cross-community effort on enhancing ICANN accountability proceeded to launch a second work stream focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation could extend beyond the Transition.

So, this community effort produced a final report in November 2018 that contained over 100 consensus-based recommendations. Following Board actual in November 2019, some of the Work Stream 2 recommendations directed at ICANN Org and Board were placed into the implementation planning phase while others have already been implemented and/or are currently in the implementation process.

So, we invite you to read a blog post that was issued last week on March 4th which contains progress updates on these implementation efforts. And if a colleague could post a link in the chat while I'm speaking, that would be great.

So, notably, ICANN Org has convened an internal Work Stream 2 Cross-Functional Project Team composed of 15 subject matter experts to complete the implementation planning necessary for those recommendations not already implemented. This effort includes determining suitable implementation paths while considering appropriate resources, planning, and prioritization cycles.

So, the Cross-Functional Project Team has also began discussing how ICANN [Org] can best support the community groups as they consider implementing relevant Work Stream 2 recommendations in light of the committee's overall workload. ICANN Org will be engaging with the committee as appropriate on how to best provide that support.

Implementation planning of Work Stream 2 recommendations remains a priority for the Org throughout FY21 and beyond. ICANN Org's commitment to implementation has also been proposed as a priority in the FY22 planning documents that were recently under public consultation.

We'll be announcing the dates of a dedicated Work Stream 2 webinar in the coming weeks during which the team will provide you with more information on the Org's efforts to [absolve] this really important work. And we look forward to your participation in this webinar. Stay tuned.

With that, I will give the virtual microphone back to my colleague, Negar, who will walk you through updates on some of our other projects. Thank you for your attention.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Alice. Next slide, please. Allow me to provide a bit of an update on the status of where we are with the evolution of the multistakeholder model project. The community-wide effort on this project identified six overarching issues that are hindering the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model.

Further to those discussions, the community then prioritized the six topics down to top three priority items for immediate term implementation. I want to clarify that just because the topics have been prioritized doesn't mean the other three topics that have been identified are not going to be addressed. The intent was just to make sure that we focus on the first three due to the fact that there is a lot of work going on, and the community bandwidth and the Org bandwidth is captured by other projects.

So, for the immediate term, we will be focusing on three topics which are: the prioritization of work and efficient use of resources, precision in scoping of work, and consensus representation and inclusivity as the areas of work for the immediate future.

Implementation planning is in progress, of course, and I wanted to point out that further discussions that took place with the community yielded a number of activities and projects associated with each of

these three topics that are currently on their way within community—
the Org and/or the Board—and this discussion has also identified gap
areas that need to be addressed so that we can cohesively alleviate the
issues that have been identified.

Currently, we're evaluating the gaps that have been identified and the
amount of work that is involved in addressing each of those. And we're
also monitoring the progress that's being made on those work areas
that are already in progress. And there are quite a few number of them.

Another point that's important to make is that we're also designing and
evaluation methodology process. This is an important element of
successful implementation of this project. The purpose of this
methodology is to help the organization, the Board, and the community
be able to monitor the progress of work that's being made towards
addressing these gap areas and the issues, and the work that's
currently underway; but also assess the effectiveness of
implementation [inaudible] involving the multistakeholder model.

So, this is an ongoing work. We'll continue to provide updates to
everyone and continue to work with the community in addressing these
issues and work areas. The implementation of the enhancing of the
multistakeholder model project is not a standalone initiative. It is
rather a holistic approach that involves the multistakeholder model by
including not only existing work efforts that are taking place, but also
future projects and needs that arise as the model evolves.

So, I look forward to working with all of you on this and helping evolve our multistakeholder model for it to be much more effective and impactful.

And this brings us to the end of the presentation portion of our webinar today. I will pass this on now to my colleague, Pamela Smith, to walk us through the Q&A section of this webinar.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Negar. And thank you, everyone, for joining us. We do have one comment from Jonathan Zuck. "Given the 'adoption' of CCTRT Recommendation 1 on the collection of data, I wonder if the life cycle diagram could be amended to suggest that the data related to the issue being addressed and the solvency of the particular recommendation are collected."

XAVIER CALVEZ: Pamela, I'm happy to take that comment from Jonathan if you would like.

PAMELA SMITH: Please, Xavier. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Pamela. Thank you, Jonathan. So that everyone understands, and I will be transparent that I exchanged comments with Jonathan privately in the chat because I wanted to better understand

his comment. And, Jonathan, you will correct me if I haven't adequately understood it.

But I believe Jonathan's point is to emphasize that throughout the life cycle of a review, the data collection is necessary, important, and should inform the work at each of the phases whether it is at the time of producing recommendations on the basis of information and data where it is relevant to also inform the implementation process in order to use data-based and fact-based information in order to be able to implement recommendations effectively.

And if you think about it this way, also to use data in order to measure the effectiveness of the implemented recommendations to confirm that the recommendations, as implemented, have had the desired effect.

So, Jonathan, if I haven't correctly understood your comment, please let me know. And Jonathan's point is [that] reflecting this in the diagram of the life cycle may be helpful, and we'll take that in consideration in our future representations of that life cycle of representation. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Xavier. And Jonathan confirms that that's about it in the chat. I think there were a couple of other issues you were going to address, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:	Yes, thank you. I think there was a question from—I'm trying to go back to it further up in the chat—from Velimira Grau. And I apologize if I'm mispronouncing your name. I think that the question was at the end of the comment a little bit earlier. "I would be interested to know how does the process ensure that recommendations are implemented in a timely way?"

It's a very important topic that your question is raising. It's always a challenge to ensure timely implementation. And just to give a few pointers about how time is managed along the life cycle of reviews, there's a number of guidelines and then there's a number of constraints to help with the implementation timeline of review. The guidelines are about how long, for example, a review should take.

[While the work of the review teams] is usually not constrained formally with a specific timeline, there's guidance and guidelines that are offered and used by the review teams to determine how long the review should take. There are some formal requirements about this timeline whereas, for example, once a report has been submitted to the Board, the Board has formally six months to consider the report that has been submitted with recommendations in them.

Once the Board has adopted, the recommendations that have been adopted move into a phase of a future implementation. One of the challenges that we deal with today is that there are so many "recommendations" at this stage of implementation, or coming into implementation soon, that there is a little bit of a backlog type of

challenge that requires that we determine prioritization of the recommendations for the purpose of implementation.

And I mentioned earlier in the session, that there's also not just a bandwidth issue, but also a dependency issue that requires that some prioritization of those recommendations/implementations is being performed to so that there is an inadequate sequence applied to that implementation.

Then the implementation is not necessarily defined in terms of how long it should take. It obviously depends on what is being implemented. The scope of reviews is so broad that there's not been the desire or the necessity to actually define a given time of implementation because it is so dependent on what is being implemented and how.

What the organization does in order to try to have the most timely implementation of reviews is to use a fairly standard project management approach to define the project of implementation as a very purposeful project. This is also why we have dedicated a part of the organization to focus on the actual implementation, managing the project of implementation of recommendation in a very formalized structured fashion also to help improve the timeliness of that implementation, but also the transparency of the implementation and the ability to report on the progress of implementation.

Having said all that, keeping the life cycle of a given review as short as possible has been a continuous challenge, and working together as all the parts that contributed to the outcome of a review is helpful in

contributing to reducing the timing between beginning and end while ensuring, of course, that the quality of the outcome is the one desired.

I'll stop here, thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Xavier. Then we have a question. I'm just going to say Mark because I'm unsure of the pronunciation of your last name. I sincerely apologize. Question: "When does the org intend to circulate a document formally outlining the work it is carrying out and the expected goals or KPIs, as well as what community actors should be involved? We have been listening that 'it will come' for a year."

Negar, would you or Xavier like to address this one?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sure, Pamela. Thank you. Happy to. Mark, thank you very much for your questions. We certainly appreciate the community's patience as we are trying to put together the structure to help bring formalization to this process.

As you may know, the [Implementation Operations Team] was effectively created beginning of July of 2020, and part of our remit is to put together a formal structure around implementation of non-policy recommendations—meaning recommendations that are resulting from specific reviews and the work of the cross-community working groups— and provide the proper mechanisms for reporting out on this progress.

This is work that we've been dedicated to undertake and move along as part of the formation of this group, and we are hoping to have, as I pointed out during my presentation, a reporting structure published soon to be able to provide more details to the community and be able to elaborate on the work that has been undertaken by ICANN Org for quite a while now.

Xavier, is there anything you would like to add to this answer?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sure, thank you. And Mark is pointing out the challenges of keeping up with timelines with these actions, I just wanted to add, and I'll be blunt, to be honest, provide a little bit of pragmatism in addition to the point that Negar highlighted on the process that we're going through. With the pandemic, with all the work that the organization in the community is carrying out at the moment, there's been a necessity to be able to carry out work in conditions that are all affecting everyone's abilities to operate, to be clear.

And if you take, for example, the example of the MSM reform—to use the word that Mark is using, which I think he refers to the project of improving the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model—this is a broad endeavor. We have been working internally with the Board in a caucus group formed on that purpose to really try to provide framework and define how the overall program should be managed.

What I want to emphasize on this specific program is that it is not a typical project. It is really a program that touches on so many different

aspects of the multistakeholder model which is resulting from the way it was designed, and logically. It touches on many different projects that are already conceived or being carried out across the community, or the Org or the Board.

And being able to understand clearly what the components are for this program, how they are addressing the objectives and the issues that have been identified as part of this program, is very important. There's been a public comment process to help narrow down [input,] the scope of this program. That's what has been carried out over the past year. Just a mark so that you have that in the back of your mind. In order to define the scope, on the basis of defining that scope and focusing on a few of the issues that had been raised, three out of the six issues [that have] been part of the work that has occurred over the past year.

In addition, since then, based on these three issues, the organization— and specifically the Implementation Operations Team—has been working on a methodology to evaluate the desired outcomes and the goals of these various endeavors that are sometimes very general so that we are able to have a natural monitoring of the progress of that work.

I simply want to emphasize that this is not a typical project where there's a very clear beginning, very clear end, very clear desired outcome. And I think this is a very broad program that touches the entirety of the multistakeholder model, and being able to clearly monitor the activities and understand how each of these activities

achieves the desired objective and makes progress towards resolving the issues that have been addressed is, in itself, a very big endeavor.

It will last the entirety of the strategic plan cycle of five years that started last year, and we believe that it is really important to establish that methodology upfront. And it does take time, particularly in the situation of, one, confinement that we're all part of; and, [two,] workload that everyone is dealing with. And therefore, that's why it's not yet completed. And we will continue to take the time that it takes to make sure that it's adequately developed.

And just to conclude, the Board through the caucus group is monitoring closely how this work is occurring in order to ensure that it occurs adequately. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Xavier, but don't go too far. We may need you again in a short moment.

From Susan Payne, "I also would find it helpful to understand when or how we can get details of the actual steps taken in implementation of these various reviews. Blogs are too high level and this session, as pointed out, is intended only to be a very high-level overview."

Negar or Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'm happy to take that one as well. And thank you for that point. It's a very clear and important need that you're pointing out.

There are many reviews. There's a life cycle for each of them. And in addition to reviews, we have also work streams and—sorry—cross-community working groups. So, there's a lot going on, and understanding clearly where each of the various projects is at any point of time is a challenge of its own. And that's the one I think you're pointing out, and we fully agree with that.

And, while this session is, to your point, providing a quick and "high-level" comprehensive but therefore not deep understanding of each of these projects, there is further need to be able to provide more visibility more specific to each of those projects.

So, the two teams that we've mentioned are working together to try to design both a process, a cadence; and a medium, meaning where and how to provide that information on an ongoing basis in order to allow the stakeholders at any point of time to be able to refer to that information and, specifically, be able to understand a given review that is of particular interest to anyone in particular, but at the same time, providing that ability for all the reviews or the projects that are in place. So, this is ongoing work.

To be giving an illustration of what we're looking at, for example, we would like to further develop the approach of having a web page on the website dedicated to reviews that allows to provide an ongoing, timely, and always up to date visibility on the various steps of a given project and the status of those steps. That's what we're working on. That's not the only tool to help provide that type of update.

Sessions like this are also meant to contribute to that, but we definitely agree that these sessions do not, at the same time, provide breadth of understanding and depth of understanding in each of those topics. And we agree with the point that you're making that there is a need for, also, the ability to have the understanding of the details of any given one of those projects. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH:
Thank you, Xavier. From Chokri Ben Romdhane, "Do you think that the reviewing implementation processes are achievable before the end of the review cycle?"

Xavier or Negar?

XAVIER CALVEZ:
I'm happy to try to take this one. I'm not completely sure I understand the question. So, when we take on the project of implementing Board-adopted recommendations, we then plan for the implementation of those recommendations that have been adopted and we establish a workplan that aims to achieve the objectives assigned to each of those recommendations. What is the desired outcome? Therefore, what do we think we need to be able to put in place?

And we therefore define an action plan that is designed to put in place the activity, complete the project that achieves the objectives, whatever that one is. And that's what we just discussed. We need to provide visibility on or relative to all the reviews going on.

I'm not completely sure that I've addressed your question or your point, and if there is a way for you maybe to either speak or refine your question in the chat, maybe that would be helpful to insurance adequately answered.

PAMELA SMITH:

Chokri, are you able to unmute your mic and ask your question or expand on it in the chat as per Xavier's request? We'll look for it if you can. Okay. Please go ahead and clarify or augment as you can if you're still in the room. And there's one other I'm going to go ahead and read into the record for time's sake.

Finn Petersen asked, "Where can I find the status of implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations?"

Alice Jansen answered him in the chat with the blog update on Work Stream 2 and she said, "This is a blog post that was posted last week with an update on the implementation efforts to address Work Stream 2 recommendations. We will be announcing a dedicated Work Stream 2 webinar in the coming weeks during which more information will be provided." Okay.

Any further questions? Any other issues, or is everyone satisfied? Very good.

Well, we thank you for joining us. We thank you for your participation. If you're participating remotely at the public forum, please note that engagement@icann.org e-mail will be used to receive questions that you would like to ask the Board and selected members of staff. If you

have any questions ready before Thursday, simply send them ahead of time with "subject matter"—just whatever subject matter you have—in the header.

And with that, if we are done … Oh, I see a new …

LARISA GURNICK: Pamela, this is Larisa. Maybe I can …

PAMELA SMITH: Yes, Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: Now that we see a clarification from Chakri. "Are we going to implement the reviewing recommendations before the end of five years to avoid that a new reviewing cycle starts?"

So, one commentary that I'd like to add to that is that the recommendations coming out of the ATRT3 actually tackle, to a certain extent, the timing issue and that the challenge where the implementation of certain recommendations does not have an opportunity to be completed before the next review cycle begins. So, there is some help in the way that the ATRT3 had envisioned scheduling the future reviews and timing of future reviews including the deferral of some of them to accommodate for this point. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Xavier, I see that you have your hand raised. The floor is yours.

XAVIER CALVEZ:	Thank you. I wanted just to come back on the topic while there were potentially other questions being asked. I think there's a number of comments in the chat that all support the point in the need for a mechanism and a platform to be able to have updates on where reviews and other projects like this stand. I know Jonathan and Cheryl and others are making this point in addition to the question that was asked by Velimira that we answered.

I just wanted to come back on that point because it is a broad need. I want to be very clear that we completely agree with the point of the need to produce that information and to be able to maintain this access to this information on an ongoing basis.

And this is why we're trying to work on sustainable mechanisms to do that on an ongoing basis that it is not dependent on sessions like this which have, as Jonathan pointed out, the limitations of being very broad but also very being not very deep. And for each of those reviews, there's so much we can achieve in in an hour or 75-minute session. So, we are very clear on that need.

In concept, we are working on being able to produce sustainable solutions. I recognize that it's always taking longer than anyone would like from a user standpoint, and I want to point out the fact that this is work that we do care about, we do want to address. We will be extremely useful, also, from a staff standpoint to help provide those updates in the most effective and efficient fashion, and we want to carry out that work.

I just want to point out—and I will continue to do this in many other circumstances—that we all have a lot on our plates and we need to be able to prioritize that work. And unless the resources of the organization increase drastically, there is an ongoing work that we need to be carrying out. I will commit to the fact that we want to be able to make progress on this and we will provide updates.

But it will not happen tomorrow, and it will not happen in a few days. This is an important work that we want to address in a very sustainable fashion and, of course, taking into account your feedback and your input on how to do it best. And that will take its own time. It's a project of its own, and we want to do it thoughtfully, adequately, and absolutely timely with the resources that we have available to do so. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Excellent. Thank you so much, Xavier. And with that, I don't see … Unless I'm missing them, I don't see any new questions in the chat. So, we thank everyone for their participation. Hang on just a second.

We appreciate your participation and joining us. And so, as I mentioned before, if you're participating remotely at the public forum, please note that the engagement@icann.org e-mail can be used to ask additional questions. Put the subject matter in the reference line of your e-mail so we know how to address it.

Thank you so much for joining us, and have a wonderful afternoon, evening, and tomorrow. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]