EN

ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – At-Large Policy Session 2: Prioritisation Framework : ALAC Prioritisation Assessment Tool Review
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 14:30 to 16:00 AST

MICHELLE DESMYTER: This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello and welcome to the At-Large Policy Session 2: Prioritization Framework: ALAC Prioritization Assessment Tool Review. My name is Michelle DeSmyter and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted via chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I will note in the chat momentarily. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and please take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak in the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, please be sure to mute

EN

all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, if first name and last name or surname, you may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With this, I will hand the meeting back over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Please begin, Cheryl,

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Michelle. Michelle's going to be steering our presentation today with far too many slides, far too many animations, far too much information on each of them. However, we will muddle through, won't we, Michelle?

So today, just in case you don't know what session you've joined, you're here at ICANN73 of the ALAC At-Large sessions. We're going to be doing an update from the subgroup dedicated to recommendations prioritization work within the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group, which, of course, is one of the three primary pillars of the At-Large Advisory Committee and At-Large in general. You'll be hearing from members, not all of them, but a number of members of our group, of our subgroup, and we will be taking you through a round robin, our highlights and holidays tour of some of the enormous amount of work that we've done. This is a socialization exercise and it is our intention to bring you a little tasting

menu of what we've done and what we believe we will be able to do in the future but all from an At-Large and end user perspective. Next slide. Thanks.

On today's session, our session plan—and we can bring up the next part, too. Thanks, Michelle—is going to take in two unequal parts. The first part is going to be all of us from the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group Subcommittee. We're going to take you through the overview, what our work requirements were, some of the processes and methodologies that we've used, a little glimpse of some of the data captured in our deliberations to date, and have a little look in section by section on some of the recommendations and outputs regarding the At-Large Advisory Committee or ALAC Prioritization Assessment Tool, which of course, we have had to turn into an acronyms because that's essential if we're in ICANN, so it's going to be the APAT from now on.

The second part—thanks, Michelle—is dedicated—about 30 minutes or so—to the ICANN Organization aspect of the approaches that they're taking to this massive prioritization exercise. There are many more considerations and we have had to be bothered to look at. We hope we've got it so they plug and play fairly well. But overall resourcing and other considerations need to come into their planning. And you'll be hearing from Xavier, Becky, and Giovanni on that in a latter section. Then click once more and once more again—thanks, Michelle— because we'll just do a little next steps before we leave. On to the next slide. Thanks so much.

What we've done is since we did what was called a thresher exercise, which was conducted back in October, November 2020, at whatever face-to-face meeting. You remember those face-to-face meetings? We've had one way back then. Not our last one but one way they've been. And we did this exercise where we went through and listed and looked at all of the various recommendations that have come out of cross-community efforts, things like the Work Stream 2, and also the evolution of the multistakeholder model and a number of the specific reviews. So we've been meeting weekly or usually weekly since December 2020, and we've done deep diving and analysis on all of these recommendations.

If you can click again—thanks, Michelle—I just wanted to let everybody know that if you want to know more details, because this is a highlights tour today, this is a live link to the wiki workspace. It lists everything we've done, recordings of everything we've said, all the background material, various presentations. But most importantly, I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that we have core members and they're the members many of whom you'll be hearing from today. But we also have contributing and ad hoc members listed here in our wiki workspace, the contributing members essential to our process and how we believe we're getting the most out of this exercise of looking at how we believe as ALAC and At-Large prioritization should be argued for in the wider scheme of things on all of these various recommendations. And we brought in subject matter experts or the leads, often of chairs or co-chairs of the review teams, the authors of the recommendations, the leads and co-leads of the themes and work

EN

tracks. And we heard from them and discussed with them all of the details, the rationale, and the evidence that we needed to do what we have done and what we'll be showing you today. Next slide. Thank you very much.

It's been a lot of work. Click again. Thanks. Basically, we started this balancing exercise and we started off with some 201 recommendations on the books. We'll see what's happened to those recommendations a little bit. What we did is we applied a filter to our discussion. We were looking at assessing from an At-Large end user perspective, the effort, urgency, and therefore then overall priority of where we thought each and every one of these recommendations and indeed sub recommendations it's going to fall. Next slide. Thank you. And you can click again. Thanks.

The APAT tool that we've come up with started off looking a little bit like this back in July 2021. It was a bare bones set of columns that we had used to assess and record and triage, for the one of a better word, each recommendation. If you click again—thanks, Michelle. We, however, discovered fairly quickly that we were going to go into a great deal more granularity. What you've seen come on screen, yes, it's too small to read, you're not supposed to read it, you're just supposed to appreciate that there's an awful lot of scary information in each and every one of these tabs in this spreadsheet tool. And there are tabs that go on for quite some columns and rows that allow us to have a highly accountable, very trackable, and very detailed record of not just what has been recommended, what the Board action has or

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

EN

has not been, where the progress is, what the At-Large and ALAC level of prioritization is, but also an ability to annotate and follow progress during the implementation as it goes on. One more click. Thanks, Michelle.

What all of these data points in this far more extensive tool, which is why it ended up being a tool, not a spreadsheet, has not only allowed us to develop something that we believe has a great deal of utility, not only just now at this beginning stages of the wider prioritization exercise to allow us to plug and play this material in to the deliberations to come with the rest of the ICANN community, but it also allows us to get relatively clear, we hope, and quite concise graphic information out of it, which we hope will allow the casual viewer to have a good enough understanding to develop a trust and a degree of understanding in what it is or what this is about. Next slide. Thank you. I'm almost finished with my part. Once more, thanks for the click.

What this is all coming towards is for us to be able to plug in to the next type, the next sort of prioritization exercise that will be going on. This is just a very simple, very traditional choice of a quadrant prioritization quadrant. Many of you will be familiar with this or similar sorts of things. And from our point of view, our prioritization allows us to try and best argue and make a rationale for what we think we must have, we should have, we could have. The graphic says "won't have" but in fact what we believe, it's probably—well, we won't have now but we may come back to it again. If you click one more, Michelle.

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Most importantly, in consideration with the available resources and circumstances at any one time. One more click, which should take us to the next slide. Thank you, Michelle. And click again.

This is the type of information we have got out. You will see that we have been able to rank as low, medium, high, but then we actually ended up having to split high into other strata. So we have high+, high++, and we felt that was easy enough for people to understand. That's the breakdown of analysis of our recommendations on all these priorities as colonnaded by the various review teams and activities. One more click. Thanks, Michelle.

At this point, I am going to take a sip of my coffee and pass on to Sébastien and Daniel who are going to take you to through ATRT3, and then they will pass on to Marita, and so on and so on. Thanks, everybody. Over to you, Séb.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Well done. I am Sébastien Bachollet, ATRT3 shepherd and EURALO chair. Regarding ATRT3 work, the group issued five recommendations, and we will go through the Board with some of them. The first one is assessment of specific and organizational review. It's high priority for ATRT3. All the current Bylaws mandated review were explored in detail and a new holistic review was recommended. The Board split this recommendation in six items and approved them subject to prioritization. Prioritization and rationalization of activity, policy, and recommendation, it was high for

ATRT3. It is exactly what we are doing here and it was approved by the Board.

The next one is accountability and transparency, transparency relating to strategic and operational plans, including accountability indicators. Medium priority for ATRT3. The Board split this—where we are? Not in the same rank as it was supposed to be done. Okay.

Then public input, low priority for ATRT3. The Board split this recommendation in two items and approved them subject to prioritization.

Assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendation, low priority for ATRT3. The Board approved it subject to prioritization. And the one I was talking about earlier was not at the right place but accountability and transparency relating to strategy and operational plan. It was approved subject to prioritization and it was split in different parts. Now I give the floor to my colleague, Daniel Nanghaka. Thank you very much.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Sébastien, for going through those respective appropriate recommendations that came from the ATRT3. I'm Daniel Nanghaka. I'm the ATRT3 implementation shepherd and also a member of the ALAC Prioritization Working Group. Next slide, please.

So if you look at how we have gone into the deliberations, there are mainly five recommendations. Out of these five recommendations,

each of those recommendations was broken down into various recommendations and the issue of each. So after the deliberations and discussions, we found out that at least of the priority areas, the highest number, over 28%, require a lot of high priority based on the ALAC recommendation. Meanwhile, also others were considered to be high out of the respective five recommendations. So, in reference to the prioritized areas, the higher priorities are being looked at and also taking into consideration some of those priorities that have already started the implementation of processes, respectively. For more details, kindly visit the Prioritization Toolkit, as many people to go deep.

But the Assessment Tool brings different levels of prioritization based on the ATRT3 recommendations, which we strongly deliberated in as seen on the respective graphs here. So, with that brief summary on the Prioritization Assessment Tool, let me give the floor to Marita Moll. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Daniel. We'll move the slide on, please. This one will be on the multistakeholder model. First of all, my name is Marita Moll. I'm a member of the NARALO representative on the ALAC and a member of this particular team as well. Cheryl mentioned something about highlights and holidays, and I'm afraid I didn't include any holidays, I'm sorry, in this particular thing. Maybe next time.

EN

The MSM part of this chart, as you can see, and it's just a small portion. And you might wonder why that is MSM. Multistakeholder model is a big strategic goal for ICANN. Well, the reason is a small piece of this chart is because it's not a stand-alone item. Actually, many parts of the multistakeholder model issues are inside some of the other Work Stream 2 CCT-RT. They come up again and again. So as far as that's just a little slice, but it's not really that easy to understand why.

The multistakeholder model actually has 11 issues inside it, which is why you see that 11 to 21 little chart, the little arrow thing there. A good number of these issues are also—I just said that. Among these 11 issues, you find roles and responsibilities, and the holistic review of ICANN, which is one of our high priority items, and also representativeness and inclusiveness. Also, high++ priority item in our evaluation on this tool.

Just a short explanation of how we arrived at 11 issues. Originally, in the process to define the issues that were causing some static in ICANN, we had a facilitator, Brian Cute, who led us through discussions and we identified 21 actual issues that needed to be resolved. Brian went through all these and eventually he came up with 11 issues. He was combining and redefining some of the things, and the community was happy with those 11 issues. Those 11 issues, you won't really see them at the moment anymore because now it's gone down to 6 issues, more combining and refining. You see some of them showing up in the budget. It's a shifting landscape. We stuck with the 11 issues because we don't want to lose track of any of these things.

So, our 11 issues are—and this is I already mentioned that the very high issues, representativeness and inclusiveness, roles and responsibilities, and holistic review of ICANN. That might sound like four but it's actually only two as they're very attached. Among the medium issues, recruitment and demographics, culture, trust, and silos, complexity consensus. Among the low issues, we have costs, but not because it's not an important issue to us but because it's not something that we as ALAC can do a great deal about. There's significant effort necessary to deal with the cost. That's not our effort. We didn't assign a priority two because it's already in progress or it's been referred to other groups. These include efficient use of resources, prioritization of work, terms, precision and scoping. So that's a sort of a roundup of all of our issues and how they fit in together.

The roles and responsibilities and holistic review of ICANN, these are high++, as I said. We have talked about them in our discussions around the budget. There is work going on among them. There's a pilot with respect to the holistic review. There's a little work. Diversity, equity, and inclusiveness expert consultant being hired to do some work, create definitions, categories, and a toolkit to move us further ahead in the representativeness and inclusiveness. We have made some comments about these in our budget discussions. But there's more work to do, and this tool helps us to do that. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just going to jump in here while you're still looking at that wonderful donut chart. And I just want to recognize the fabulous assistance that we've had from a staff in particular with the charting. [Suzie] has been amazing to get all of our gibberish on the APAT Tool to turn out into easily digestible charting like you see in front of you. What I just wanted to draw everyone's attention to before we get into one of the lion's share activities, which Olivier Crépin-Leblond will be taking us through, and that's the Work Stream 2 efforts where a great deal of progress has been made, as you'll hear, we have been looking at the chat to see whether there's any questions coming in, and if there is, Claudia will curate those questions. You are welcome to raise any questions or make any comments or interventions as we go through all of these slides. But most importantly, there is an opportunity for you to e-mail anything that isn't dealt with today. If we have time, we'll deal with them as we go through. But if something isn't dealt with today, we will be going back, looking at the questions and concerns and issues that were raised by any of you, and putting together a little bit of an FAQ. So this is a beginning of your opportunity to know more about APAT and not the end of an opportunity. When you look at the PowerPoint slides, you will find there are quite extensive speaker notes associated with most, if not all, of the slides. And there are references and links and a lot more information to dig down to. So with that, hopefully, Olivier is queued and raring to go. Michelle is going to click the button and we will be in the wonderful world of Work Stream 2.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Indeed, along with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I have been looking at Work Stream 2, which you'll notice is not a review team as the other ones have an RT, something RT. That actually was part of the enhancing ICANN Accountability Working Group, which was a follow up to the IANA stewardship transition. It dealt with a lot of things which actually often were cross-cutting with other processes in ICANN. That included increasing SO and AC accountability, improving diversity, removal of Board directors, human rights, jurisdiction, ombud's office, staff accountability, and ICANN transparency. It also included a gap analysis for each component part of ICANN to find out whether the different component parts have actually achieved their goals. We've been tracking the speed of implementation, as Cheryl mentioned earlier, looking at the effort and the urgency for these things.

Now, it's interesting because as you can see in the two diagrams currently on your screen, the Work Stream 2 recommendations are one of the lion's shares of recommendations that came out. And a fair number of them were of very high importance. As you can see here, we've only really done three different classifications high, medium, or low. You'll notice that there are just over 30 that we've considered. Whilst if you look at the number of remaining recommendations as of the August 2021 and March 2022, you'll note that it started with more than 40. And that's because some of these recommendations were actually picked up by some of the other groups so they just got basically moved on to other places. But looking at it, you can see that from August 2021 to March 2022, contrary to what some people are

saying, which is that nothing's happening at ICANN when people are not meeting. Actually, a heck of a lot has happened in ICANN. And you can see that implementation of these recommendations, which were somehow lagging for a number of years has gone really a long way. Over half of them are completed and the rest are currently being implemented.

If we can look at the pipe chart, you'll notice actually that the progress has been made since the work started, almost 90% of it being completed. You'll have some Work Stream 2 recommendations specific to SO/AC action and implementation relevant to the ALAC At-Large. Some have been completed. Some are waiting for action and decision often by a third party. You'll see it's just a small slice of it. Those in fact are included, the ones related to standard guidelines for process regarding any matter of Board removal and good faith process for rejection or budget, respectively. There's also a publishing Brief in Accountability and Transparency Conflict of Interest report, which is listed as Implementation Plan for the time being. That's coming up. But what is required is a formalized practice to aggregate an extract from other already published and regular reporting to specifically comply. This is why Implementation Plan is there as it will be an ongoing concern. Finally, publishing the policies and practices is listed as not applicable for action in the ALAC because actually that's already an established practice, and we're glad we've made some really good headway on this.

EN

That's just a quick snapshot of where we are. We're hoping to establish to get 100%, and hopefully that will be in the next time we meet. If Cheryl doesn't have anything else to add, I can hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck who's going to speak to us about the CCT-RT, Consumer Trust Review Team.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier, and welcome, everyone. There is a review that happened right after the new round that took place in 2012. That was a review of the degree to which the new gTLD program improved competition, consumer choice and trust, and that was called the CCT Review Team. And so there was a number of studies that were commissioned, a series of polls that were commissioned to try and answer those questions. There was back and forth with the Board where it became evident, it would make sense for our review team to give more granular recommendations. So as a result, there's a lot of them, there's some 40 recommendations that came out of the CCT-RT, some that were general, and some were about the organization being better prepared for the next time, there's the CCT-RT.

It's also the first review that took place after the IANA transition. So the Board had to take a different approach to it because some of the recommendations are on the table. And so they were sort of put into three bins. The first was accepted. The second, if you click, was pending. And the third was forwarded. Because there were some recommendations that were really recommendations for other

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

entities within ICANN to look at some questions, and the primary one of those was the Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

So under the accepted recommendations, there were just a few initially, including a couple that I think the Board believed were already the case, and so were not only accepted but already implemented immediately. But it's led to some questions about whether or not we communicated them successfully. They had to do with the use of data inside of ICANN and access to data for workgroups as well as future review teams. So there were some questions raised about those.

Another big category was pending. This has resulted in a great deal of work on the part of ICANN staff to look into the cost and complexity of implementing each of the recommendations that the CCT-RT made. So many of those are difficult to completely comprehend, but the net result was a recommendation by staff to move most of them into the accepted category because they were doable, but now that's pending prioritization.

Then finally, in the forwarded recommendation, there was a different kind of problem, which is that if the group to which the Board forwarded the recommendations chose not to address them, then they became kind of floating recommendations. So we made some recommendations that matter to the At-Large, including recommendations about DNS abuse, recommendations about community and applicant support that matter a great deal to this community but that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group felt

EN

should be more of a community-wide discussion rather than Subsequent Procedures, new gTLD-specific discussion. So that leaves them somewhat in a little bit of a holding pattern where they're not any longer owned by any particular group. So what's been interesting, as a result of this sort of unique nature of the CCT-RT—if you hit next again, Michelle—is that a lot of these recommendations have been recycled. They come up quite frequently in other fora, including the GAC and the SSR2, the Security and Stability Review Team. So there's a lot there to get at in terms of recommendations that the At-Large continues to believe in. But the Board has begun to push back on the At-Large on just repeating the mantra of implement the CCT recommendations, and have asked us to take a step back, take a look at where things exist today, what progress has been made, kind of reevaluate these recommendations that were basically finalized in 2017, see which ones are the most relevant and restate them as new advice from the At-Large and the GAC. So I think there'll be some more discussion about how to thread these particular recommendations together to modernize them, if you will, and turn them into concrete advice from the ALAC and the GAC. So those conversations are ongoing. But we did focus the At-Large efforts on the recommendations that were specific to helping individual end users, and less so on the institutional recommendations, the competition recommendations, more on things, as I said, like DNS support and applicant support.

So that's just a brief overview. This is something that's going to require multiple sessions in and of itself. But thanks for the time slot, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Always a pleasure, Jonathan. Click next. Thanks, Michelle. We're going to dive into SSRT in just a moment and Vanda Scartezini will be taking you through all of that in some detail on just two particular recommendations. But I just wanted to take the opportunity as we bring up SSRT. To follow on from something Jonathan said in his presentation on CCT-RT, and he brought to your attention that there was a change in the way that Board reacted to just these, in many cases, long shopping lists of recommendations that were presented as a result of very important activities but in the reports. Sébastien would have also, I think, gone into detail if time had permitted to say that ATRT3 as a review team, that worked in completely new expectations. In fact, we piloted a set of new expectations and guidelines for operations, and how recommendations are to be framed.

But with SSRT, what happened is of the very significant number of arguably, extremely, and often quite equally important recommendations. A significant number of those recommendations have not been approved for ongoing adoption and implementation by the Board or they are in a holding pattern until other things have gone on. So when you look at the figures from our starting point at SSRTs reporting and where we are in terms of our tracking of our documentation, now you will see a significant drop but that drop is not to do with implementation, necessarily. It could also be due to the fact that these were a particular recommendation that was either not going to be implemented or unlikely to be implemented. But all of that

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes. This is to Jonathan. He was talking about competition and consumer trust, and the review or the study was more confined to the formal DNS space competition within the formal DNS space. But there are quite a lot of developments happening outside the formal DNS space, which is of implication in matters of consumer trust. Would that study also expand to look at what happens without—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to stop you there. That sounds like a wonderful question to raise in one of Jonathan's yet to be gone through deeper CCT-RT sessions because it is not germane to our tool and the prioritization recommendation work that we're looking at today. Very useful, very interesting question, but one that Jonathan and his little team is probably best able to react to in their own space dedicated to it.

Okay. So let's click again then, and I'm going to hand over to Vanda, and you're going to see some additional animation as Michelle practically breaks a fingernail going through this slide. Over to you, Vanda. You might be muted, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry. Thank you, Cheryl. I believe that piece by piece is quite difficult for the people to see the whole picture of this. We have in the SSRT

EN

recommendation, 24 of them, 13% is pending prioritization. Not that it is not important, all are important. But some of them were not approved. And we are talking here really mostly about the focus on DNS abuse. So it's something that is quite interesting and I have been talking about this issue in most of the SOs and ACs in ICANN. So it's our focus on the users, the ALAC prioritization that we are talking about. So those are in progress. So if you go further to show the other issues.

So what do we, as ALAC, focus on our users, we basically decide what is medium priority, low priority, and those are 41% is completed. So we believe that in our point of view, it's just few recommendations that must be finalized and implemented. I believe it is quite important to do so as soon as possible because it's one of the most complex issues that we have in our Internet around the world and is a concern for GAC and GNSO and for all users around. So we have a lot of situation that is completed. Completed is 41.7% so I'm happy with that. The point nine is idea to ICANN shoot direct some effort to enforce more against the DNS abuse in around the world. So, I do believe that it is quite urgent for us as users in this community.

I believe it for the 12.1 is also about the abuse and that is not approved, and that the 12.1 and just 12, it's a situation in progress, and for us is also urgent because we know that DNS abuse must be in some way be enforced. And with the help of even the users, we should help to reduce the abuse in that situation. So that's our priority. I send

you, Cheryl, back to you to complement any point this small part of our recommendation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. I hope that everybody is seeing in the sampling, we're giving you slightly different information, slightly different details. What we're trying to do is bring along with this exercise a greater understanding of the types of analysis and the types of discussion that we've gone into in the small group activities that have been running, as I say, weekly, or almost every single week since December 2020. I think next cab off the rank is going to be RDS and Alan Greenberg. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We'll start with a little bit of history here because, like with Jonathan, this goes back quite a while. The first WHOIS review took place during 2010 to 2012. The second review, the one we're looking at here was 2017-19. The '17 was driven by the five-year or Bylaw requirement to restart it. Of the 22 recommendations that the WHOIS RDS review did, the second one, 14 of them were actually follow-ons to the first review, the one that dated back to 2010-12. That was really a measure of partly things had changed. But to a very large extent, we felt that although ICANN had labeled them as all complete, that we felt that there were still some gaps that had to be addressed. So it was certainly an interesting exercise.

EN

Of the 22 recommendations, the Board took action on them in a number of ways. Essentially, 4 of them at the time we did the ALAC review, this process, 4 of them were complete or essentially completed. So they were to a large extent out of the picture of our prioritization, 5 of them were in progress, 11 of them were in some stage of hiatus. That is, they were referred to another group, they were conditionally approved, waiting something, or they were pending something happening, and two of them were not approved at all. And I'll come back to those in a second. When we look at how they how the ALAC rated these recommendations, 7 of them were rated as high, 4 of them medium, and 7 of them low. If you do the arithmetic, you'll find there were 22 original recommendations, 2 of which were not approved, and 4 of which were completed. So if you add up the 7 plus 4 plus 7, you'll find we evaluated the recommendations which were not completed, including the rejected ones. Because in our evaluation, for one reason or another, those recommendations were rejected by the Board but still has some merit and we believe actually should have been acted on in one way or another. So just a little bit of insight.

Now, the situation in WHOIS and RDS as you all know is somewhat complex in ICANN. The WHOIS review started in 2017. In 2018, the world got turned upside down because ICANN started it's EPDP addressing GDPR. So halfway through our process of coming up with recommendations, it became quite clear that many of the issues we were looking at, we're going to be more and more confused, not clarified by what we were saying.

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

EN

In fact, the GDPR, the EPDP, more currently, the European Network and Information Security Directive (NIS2) and now the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team have made all of this a very, very gray area. There are just so many dependencies, both, if things can be done, when things can be done, how things can be done, that the ALAC or anyone putting priorities on some of these becomes—I won't say a joke—but becomes somewhat of a paradox. Because as important as we think some of these may be, there are just so many dependencies that it's not just a matter of will and allocation of resources to get them actually done or addressed. So we're in a funny state that's going to require an almost continual review as things change in our environment, both in terms of legislative and legal issues as we understand both how the GDPR and later NIS2, assuming it's adopted, affect the environment we're looking at. So interesting world, it's been an interesting exercise, but it's one that's going to have to keep on going for quite some time. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hadn't managed to unmute quickly enough. My apologies. Sorry, the last little bit that just came up on screen, just to remind you that in the case of [inaudible] see on this bar chart in front of you that there is considerable progress. It's a point that was made by Olivier but it's a point that is also shown by our tool. And if we can click again now. Thanks, Michelle. That's what I want to talk to you about. Where we see this APAT, this ALAC Prioritization Assessment Tool, what its uses what its utility is, clearly, there is an enormous amount of information

in this full spreadsheet of tool. It is not for the faint-hearted to dive in. It is a living document. It is intended to be something now that can track over time changes and allow for reallocation of different prioritizations as resourcing or circumstances change. We've also now designed it so that other things, other recommendations can be plugged into it in their own little sheet. So some future specific or even organizational review recommendations could be plugged into it and appropriately tracked.

Why is this important? Well, a number of us on this small group, veterans of a couple of review team processes over the years, and as Alan just identified, so often there is this gulf at the beginning of a second review or third review with its ability to look back easily and track and find what has happened and being implemented from recommendations in earlier reviews. What we think is part of the utility of this tool is to allow ALAC going forward and the At-Large community a mechanism where they can watch this and understand, and more importantly, look over time as to where things came from, what they were meant to achieve, and what has been either achieved in their implementation or of course they could be totally no longer relevant, and that's all right, too. You have to be able to take things out of the queue as well.

The bar chart you've got here, of course, is one of the other great benefits of the APAT, and that is that we can show progression. That's a considerable progress. As Olivier said, so many of us have heard people complain and say, "Oh, nothing's going on. Well, actually, look

at that. That's empirical evidence in our view that a lot has been going on." But until we measure it, until we can graph it, until we can show it and make it easily understood, sometimes it can be a little bit easy to assume the worst instead of look for the best. That being said, we'll always be open to building a better model. And some of you may have expertise and wish to join us as [inaudible] to see where we can take APAT next. Click to the next slide. Thanks, Michelle.

So we've included here at this space, which is where we're tending towards the end of our almost hour for our part, and we're going to try and ensure that Org has a good half hour for this, and then come back for a few closing moments and any outstanding questions to be dealt with towards the end. But as we transition to the next part with ICANN Org and Xavier's team with Becky and Giovanni, I know Giovanni had technical issues earlier, I hope they've been fixed, but I'm sure they can still hold that out. I just wanted to draw your attention to those presentations and the wiki workspace. The wiki workspace has an enormous wealth of information for you. Please dig in. Our meetings are open, you are welcome to join. We do not go back over things again unless they are being reprocessed. But they are certainly meetings which you may be able to benefit from. And with my chameleon coming on stage now, that's to remind me and Michelle to click and stop all this bright color and thank all of our many presenters out of our subgroup, our core group of members of the OFB Subcommittee. Click once more and you'll be in the hands of ICANN Org until I wrestle back the microphone.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Hi, Cheryl. Hi, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Can you hear me?

BECKY NASH: Yes, we can hear you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. First, I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to participate to this session, which is really interesting, and first to compliment not only what we've seen in this presentation but all the work that At-Large has carried out over the past, I want to say, year and a half or nearly two years on prioritization to provide an illustration. Those of us who work on planning and prioritization in the Org feel like when you're walking in the desert, and then suddenly you see another caravan that walks in the same direction, they're suddenly your friends right away. So that's how we feel about what you were doing because we very much think prioritization is critical to our collective effectiveness. And your work on that topic is demonstrating to everybody in the community what it takes to do, what it is. You're living that work of the community and we think this is extremely helpful. I'm sure that the benefit of the work that you have been putting through this exercise will soon become very visible to everyone as part of the collective prioritization activities that we are about to carry out, which Becky will speak more about. Next slide, please.

I just wanted to spend a quick couple of minutes to using this diagram to try to explain a little bit what is going on and how things relate together. Because in a previous discussion with a few of you, it was clear that there's questions as to who's doing what and how. So starting from the left here, the planning department that Becky leads was created a year and a half ago, in July 2020 and concentrated and grouped together all the planning activities of ICANN. Becky transferred from the finance department to this new department to lead it. Within the work of that department, as many of you already know, in the five-year operating plan, there is an operating initiative called Planning at ICANN. It's one of the 15 operating initiatives. And within that prioritization was laid out at the time of this new five-year plan a few years ago as a key priority to address.

The prioritization framework of the Org launched towards the end of 2020, not that far away from the time that you started also working on prioritization. That work started within the Planning team and several of you participated to the engagement sessions that the team carried out with all the community organizations including At-Large. You know that this prioritization framework work is now just about to include a pilot on prioritization. That pilot is focused a little bit coincidentally, but I'll come back to that, on specific review recommendations and that implementation work. That's what we're about all to work on together. And of course, all the work that you will have carried out on this topic will benefit of course your participation and the input that you will have to provide and I definitely expect a lot of valuable outcome of your work becoming input into that process.

So there's a little arrow on the bottom that says that various organizations that appear in the box on the right in purple here are electing or providing representatives to participate in this pilot. You won't be surprised that Cheryl is the At-Large representative into that pilot group that will start to work soon. And of course, her experience in ATRT3 Recommendation #5, which is about prioritization, her experience even with the work that you all have carried out will obviously translate in that valuable input during the pilot [inaudible].

So the resumes, that's the red arrow from the middle box. The reviews, the recommendations, and the implementation work of that is the subject of the pilot. In the second box in the middle, the implementation operations department, which was also created in July 2020, is headed by Giovanni Seppia, that many of you know. Giovanni started a few weeks ago, early January. And that department is in charge of implementing Board-adopted non-policy recommendations, meaning review recommendations, but also CCWG recommendations in the general scope of that department's responsible to use. WS2 is the priority. That's the department that is in charge of implementing WS2 within the organization as well as project managing, all the efforts for WS2 as an example, and that's what you see in that box. So, the implementation operations department is focused on implementation work of review recommendations. The pilot that Becky's team in planning is leading has for scope the review recommendations, and separately, there is—I was taking the example of WS2 as one of the topics on which Giovanni's team work and lead the project management work—for the purpose of WS2. Because there

are so many different parties involved in implementing that work, because there are recommendations from WS2 that are for the community organizations to consider to implement, we have suggested that a WS2 implementation group is created, the coordination group to share experience, benefit from practices, and experience that each of the community groups has even working on that implementation and can be shared with the rest of the other organizations as well as Org, of course, sharing its experience and input on the implementation of the WS2 recommendation that it implements. So this is a separate group. Also, a number of representatives are being appointed by each organization to that "working group". It's really meant to be simply for visibility for sharing experiences and to building more efficient all together in this implementation of WS2.

So that's those two different groups, you may have seen calls for representatives for either of those two groups, and may have wondered what this was all about. This is what this diagram was trying to explain. I don't know if there's any questions, which we're happy to address. If there is not any, we'll pass it on to Becky next.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Xavier. And thank you, Cheryl and team, for having us here today. This is a very informative session, and we're very happy to have the opportunity to present from the Org standpoint. Next slide, please.

So as Xavier just indicated in the introduction, the planning department is involved with one of the 15 operating initiatives in ICANN's operating plan. And the 15 operating initiatives represent the main areas of activities that support the achievement of ICANN strategic plan. So one of those operating initiatives that were included in the adopted Five-Year Operating and Financial Plan for FY21 and for Fiscal Year '22, and have been included in the draft Operating Plan and Budget for Fiscal Year '23.

So a component of the planning that ICANN operating initiative is to deliver a draft prioritization framework as an enhancement of ICANN's overall planning process. So it is the ICANN's planning department that's leading this operating initiative and is the team in charge of the delivery of the draft prioritization framework. But what we'd like to highlight is that the prioritization framework as a deliverable is to be used during the annual planning process. And the annual planning process, specifically the area that we are addressing here, is the development of the operating plan and the financial plan.

So, just to highlight that, the goal is to hold a prioritization step up front or at the beginning of the planning process. And this differs very much from what has been presented in this session by the At-Large OFB subgroup. So we're talking about a new step in ICANN's planning process where we will collaborate with the community to set out the priorities before ICANN Org then begins the process of developing detailed plans and identifying resources. So the key is that the prioritization step is really about the activities and understanding and

EN

collaboration with the community what are the most urgent and most important aspects to be planned for. Then this output from a step early on in the planning process will be received by ICANN Org who will then go to contemplate or develop plans that are then included in the proposed draft Operating Plan and Budget that go out for public comment. So this step in the planning process is outlined as part of our overall planning process, and we do have a resource slide indicating ICANN's overall planning process.

So the planning prioritization framework, again, a regular step in the planning process, but in order to develop the framework, we've conducted over 17 different consultations with the community. In some cases, some of the organizations asked us to meet twice to discuss how to develop a new process within the planning process. As a result, one of the proposals was to run a pilot or conduct a pilot. And we like to highlight that the pilot is suggested to be conducted on only one aspect of work, just so that we can have a hands-on test of this new process, including some prioritization techniques, in order to foster collaboration and to have lessons learned before implementing a new step in the planning process. The scope of the pilot is on Board-approved specific review recommendations. So it is one area of focus for the pilot.

Once we conduct the pilot and seek additional input both from the group that will be participating in the pilot and from the public, then we will look to make a recommendation on a version two of a draft framework. We were able to publish a version one as we go into the

pilot. But again, this will be an ongoing collaboration in order to ensure that a new step in the overall planning process is one that helps us plan and enhance the planning process together.

So I hope that this gives a short presentation of the overall view of the planning prioritization framework and the pilot, and how it does differ from some of the work that the At-Large team has done to date. So I will pause here before asking my colleague, Giovanni.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Becky? Becky, there was a question in chat you may not have seen it, got past. Perhaps Claudia or Michelle could get that to you. It had to do with the pilot. Thanks.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Becky. I can read the question. It's from Sivasubramanian. "How is the pilot organized? Is it a simulation or a scale down implementation? Is it organized like a 'drop it if the pilot does not work,' or as a definite first step? What are the usual timelines, and the scale of budgetary allocated for pilots?"

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much for your question. That is a very good question about overall the approach. What I'd like to draw everyone's attention

EN

to—and we will put a link in the chat—that the Org team, as part of this project, did launch the project with a large number of consultations. And in the consultations, we then were able to document the feedback received and have a suggestion on a proposed framework along with the proposed pilot, and we just published prior to the ICANN meeting, a summary document that outlines both the suggested framework and also the suggestion for the pilot. So the pilot is going to be organized as a hands-on test for how to approach a prioritization dialogue and the use of prioritization techniques. So we will be using a technique to foster that decision-making, and the key is that it is not a go-no-go situation, which is I think what one of your questions was. So we plan to improve the already suggested first draft of the 2B or the process that we're suggesting for a prioritization step in the annual planning process. So it is not going to be a drop the efforts in collaboration with the community.

I think one of your questions just happened to be the resourcing for this particular effort. And to note as part of the FY22 adopted plan, the resourcing of this is funded from within ICANN Org on the Org side, and then we're collaborating with community members that have been nominated to join the pilot. So I hope that answers your question. Is there a follow-on question there? Sorry.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yeah. It looks like Siva put a follow-up question in the chat. If you'd like, I can read that.

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

BECKY NASH: Sure. Thank you very much, Claudia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. It says, "Why not go ahead with implementation with a built-in reset button? That should make the organization far more efficient and would surprisingly save costs even if you count implementations dropped?"

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much for your question. The suggestion for a pilot was to complete the FY23 Operating Plan and Budget process. The reason why we want to go forward with the pilot is also to ensure that we collaborate on lessons learned for this approach to form a community-led prioritization group and to use techniques. We will then be moving into an implementation, understanding that we want to make sure that our planning process which is very collaborative, open and transparent and invites the general public as well into the process to make sure that this process does work and keeps evolving to ensure best practices are adopted in such a step.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Becky, this is Claudia. We have Siva with his hand up.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: My comment is more of ICANN seems to be expanding processes, building processes one on top of another, inserting a stage here, topping it up with another phase. And all in effect, consume years of time, which is not there in the Internet space, where technology evolves so fast, developments happen so fast. Shouldn't we be cutting down on processes rather than thinking of methodical, elaborate, sequential ways of doing work and doing planning? I mean, I'm not against planning, it needs to be swift, and the implementation phases also need to be swift. That's in part a question and in part a comment. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much for your comment. And we've taken that into consideration. I think in the interest of time, we may want to move to the next section. I'll just pause.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks, Becky. I hope you can hear me well. If we can move to the next slide, please. This slide is about Implementation Operations Team and what we are doing. The Implementation Operations Team is responsible of the implementation of Board-approved non-policy recommendations, as Xavier said at the very beginning. Our work focuses on the recommendations coming from specific reviews and the WS2, as well as enhancing the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model, as I will say later. Our work includes design, planning, scheduling, project managing the implementation work for

the recommendation, as well as managing the evaluation and the final report of the implementation.

If we look at the specific reviews, which Cheryl and the other ALAC members touch based on very well, we have the Accountability and Transparency Review. I'm going to say the full name and not the short because one of my, let's say, objective is to make reviews as close as possible to the community. So I'll try to avoid shorts and acronyms and have the full name. So I'm just saying the Accountability and Transparency Review, which has five approved recommendations that are divided into 15 components. We have done the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review with 63 recommendations, out of which 13 have been approved by the Board. Then we have the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review with 35 recommendations, out of which 17 have been approved by the Board. And the RDS which is Registration Directory Service Review, WHOIS2, with 22 recommendations, out of which 15 have been approved by the Board.

We have also the 116 recommendations coming from the Work Stream 2 of the ICANN accountability process. And those are top priority for the Fiscal Year '22 and also for Fiscal Year '23 Operating Plan and Budget. Within the Work Stream 2, as Implementation Operations Team, we have been supporting the work to set up the Community Coordination Group, which aims to be a collaborative space for discussions relating to implementation of the WS2, Work Stream 2,

recommendations that can benefit from uniform community coordination.

Over the past two months, I started two months ago, I've been very aware of the work that has to be done in terms of implementing recommendations. I really appreciate what Cheryl and the others have said that there's been quite a lot of progress. But I was saying that I'm quite aware of the work that has to be done, of the need to make the review and recommendation implementation process closer to the community, of the community request to share more timelines when it comes to the expected implementation date of the recommendation.

I took note of all what I heard from different community meetings I participated over the past two months, and I'd like to reassure you that those are the top priorities of the Implementation Operations Team. That is why we have started to revamp the community wiki space about specific review and the progress against the implementation of the different recommendations. And we are going to roll out new pages where the progress against the implementation of the different recommendations is going to be immediately visible. We are going to do the same on the ICANN Org pages. And this is again to make the whole review and implementation of recommendation process as close as possible, as accessible as possible to the larger community.

As I was saying, the last point on this slide is that we have also started to work on enhancing the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. This is a project for which we have developed internal action

EN

plan that we plan to share with the community in the coming months. And when I say the coming months, I do not mean the coming 50,000 months but really in the coming months. The plan is based on the paper that was released in October 2020, where the community identified six work areas that would benefit from refinement and improvement of existing efforts to enhance the multistakeholder model effectiveness.

As some of you know quite well, out of the six areas, the community prioritized already three areas. Out of these three areas, there are about 20 projects initiatives that are currently underway. I highlighted that in the October 2020 paper. The approach for enhancing the ICANN multistakeholder model is to evaluate these projects with the final objective to achieve incremental and continuous improvements. And this approach comes from the consultations that were held at community level and also at Board level across the past two years. This is also in the pipeline. There's going to be also a dedicated community wiki page about the multistakeholder model announcing the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model, as well as a page on icann.org in the future. But first, there was going to be this community wiki page.

So this is, in a nutshell, what implementation operation does. Again, we really aim to make the process as close to the community as possible, but also to make progress on the different sets of recommendations in the coming months and to provide you updates

EN

about what ICANN Org is doing against the different recommendation sets.

I'm happy to answer any question. I don't know if there is any question in the chat. I'm happy to answer any question. That said, feel free to drop me a line. Anybody of my team, you can drop a line to ask about where we stand with the different recommendation sets and their implementation. Again, any question? I see the hand's up from Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Giovanni. It's not just targeted to you but all Xavier teams. I feel a bit in trouble with how all that is organized. We have Bylaw mandated reviews and it's mixed with something which is not Bylaw mandated. And some of the elements from the multistakeholder model, very important but it's included in, for example, ATR3.

My second point, just as a comment is that it used to be that ATRT was the main model of the reviews, and therefore need to be taken into account as the first one. When it was led by the NTIA representative by the chair of the GAC and by the chair of the Board, there was no discussion on that. And I don't see why because we changed the organization of the group, the priority of this review is changing. I feel that there's something we—at least I am in disagreement with the Board as they put that we need to prioritize that against the other. Thank you.

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Sébastien. If I can take the overall at high level before I leave the floor to Xavier, I understand he also wants to take the floor, I just like to say that the Implementation Operations Team is a brand new team, we are requested to work on a set of priorities, including giving priorities to WS2 recommendations, which is something that as I said, it's in the Fiscal Year '22 and Fiscal Year '23 as a top priority. We are fully committed to deliver on what is our mandate, the mandate of our team. Not so sure I understand the politics behind giving priority to one review or another. As I said, for me, one of the top priorities of my team is to show the progress as well as to make the entire process of reviews and implementation of recommendation familiar to the community. Because as a former member of the community, I believe there is quite a lot of work to be done in that area as well. That said, I like to leave the floor to Xavier. I'm sure he wants to complement what I just said. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Giovanni, and thank you, Sébastien, for the point. Very practically, Org is subject to the decisions of the Board, and therefore, what we work on is what the decisions that the Board has made in adopting a number of recommendations across a number of reducing and that becomes the "to-do list" of the Org. We, Org, do not have the authority to prioritize review against the other. You pointed out to the Bylaws, which is what we all use. And there's no specific order of priority of reviews within the Bylaws in the point about everything that

we are working on at the moment, which is to prioritize the work, is to enable the community's voice in that prioritization exercise. The pilot is bringing together the representatives across the community to provide a community view to the prioritization. I am sure that ATRT3 will be the subject of discussions as to whether it should be prioritized or not as part of this pilot and it will therefore be a platform to make that statement for those who desire to do so. We think that's also the most adequate way to determine what the community prefers to do and it prefers that is implemented first or in priority. So we look forward to the community's input there. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I've wrestled the microphone back from the very clean Org team. I want to thank [inaudible] we remain ready, willing and able to assist you in digesting it further and with greater accuracy. I'd like you to just, while you're thanking with your virtual applause everybody involved today, especially our fabulous support staff, the tech teams, the interpreters, just remind you that triage is something that is constantly reviewed and that it's very easy to change from being a first priority to a third priority, and indeed, from a third priority and substrate in the morgue. So let's not let that happen to any of our highly critical and most important recommendations. But those that can't be helped just have to be put to the side.

One more click and it will be a link to say my thank you, but also that link of that slide to At-Large staff, please put any of your questions, comments and further interventions. Claudia, Michelle, Heidi, and the

EN

incredibly hardworking small group team will put some sort of FAQ response back if anything has not been dealt with in today's call. With that—and on time—ladies and gentlemen, I thank you all. Bye for now.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Bye. Thank you all.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you so much, everyone. Meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM