SINGAPORE – AoC and Organizational Reviews: Supporting ICANN Accountability
Monday, February 9, 2015 – 15:30 to 16:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen, let me introduce ICANN Board Bruce Tonkin.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay. Welcome to the session which is on the reviews that are part of our Affirmation of Commitments program. And also organizational reviews that are conducted as part of the requirements under the bylaws to review parts of the organization such as the GNSO.

To avoid sort of occupying all the time with presentations, what I suggest is that each of the speakers just highlight in one or two minutes any critical areas of the review and any conclusions that have been reached so far, but really use most of this time to ask questions. There are presentations available on the Web site for each one of these reviews that you can read and hopefully that will prompt questions.

So starting, I guess, with introductions, I'll perhaps first ask Denise Michel to briefly talk about the AoC reviews and the status there.

DENISE MICHEL: All right. Thank you, Bruce. So again, please look at the slides on the session Web page there. They contain a wealth of information. We want to make sure we give ample time for you to discuss some of the issues around review. So we'll go very quickly here.

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.

I'd like to turn to David Conrad, then Margie Milan, and then Larisa Gurnick to give you just really quick thumbnail updates on the implementation of the current AoC reviews and then we'll move into a discussion about schedule. David.

DAVID CONRAD: I am David Conrad, ICANN CTO, and I have some responsibility for working out with the implementation of the SSR, security, stability, resiliency, review team recommendations.   Currently we have completed 19 of the recommendations. There are actually, I believe, 28 total. In process there are about 9 that are being worked on. We are currently evaluating all of the recommendations to ensure from a staff perspective that they've been completed or are moving correctly in the right direction, and that has resulted in some additional work on staff's part trying to understand what additionally needs to be done. But we are moving ahead in a pretty reasonable fashion, from my perspective. So with that, I will give it to --

BRUCE TONKIN: So David, just before handing, out of those recommendations, are there any in particular that you might want to seek feedback on with respect to implementation from the audience. Are any sort of getting stuck or hard that you want some feedback?

DAVID CONRAD: There are a few that we do -- we will be looking for additional commentary from the community.   For example, one of the recommendations is related to working with various communities, the

security-related communities, to set best common -- best practices. We actually need input from the communities to understand exactly which communities we can appropriately interact with because some of these communities tend to be sensitive about the information they share. For example, sometimes we work with law enforcement in the context of security and stability. Sometimes those entities do not wish to divulge how much they're interacting with us, and ICANN needs to understand from the community at what level is that appropriate. There are other recommendations that we will be going back to the community for some clarification, some additional input, and we'll hopefully be doing that within the next couple of weeks.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, David. Margie, WHOIS review.

MARGIE MILAM: Hello.   One of the areas that I really focus on is managing the WHOIS implementation-related activities. There was a session just in the other room about all things WHOIS and you can -- I refer you to those materials to really get a sense for where we are on it.

Essentially three years after the review team recommendations were adopted, we're still -- have nine -- nine that are completed, six that are in process. And of the ones -- and one that is in planning. Of the work that's outstanding, the -- there's several aspects that need policy development and those are the ones that are -- what you see in process. These are the privacy and proxy accreditation policy issues, the issues related to translation and transliteration of contact data. Essentially

until that work is complete, we won't be finished with the WHOIS review team recommendations and we may be in a situation that we'll be starting up the next review team while we're still doing implementation of these recommendations. So it's definitely a much longer term process.

Of the work that's not community-related, there's about two recommendations that relate to the accuracy reporting system that I talked about in the session before. That is a staff-driven project to develop accuracy reports. And that system is -- development is currently underway, and it will be about a year or so before that work is complete. So essentially that's the WHOIS update.

BRUCE TONKIN: Excellent. Thanks, Margie. Larisa, the Affirmation of Commitments as the transparency and accountability. We've actually had that review twice, so you'll be talking about the implementation of the second accountability and transparency review.

LARISA GURNICK: Hi, everybody. Implementation of recommendations from the second ATRT2 began upon Board action of June 2014. Implementation methodology for improvements is being -- is based on the global standards of the project management institute with a goal towards achieving professional excellence. This is accomplished through clear scope definition, company-wide resource planning, and monitoring against timelines as well as consistent reporting. This implementation

ICANN | 52
Singapore

methodology is a pilot. If it's successful, it will be applied to all the other review implementation projects.

The implementation teams finished their planning and they're now making progress toward implementation of improvements and there will be several slides that you're welcome to reference to see the progress in more detail. With 51 distinct recommendation components that comprise the 12 ATRT2 recommendations, the time frame for implementation will vary depending on the complexity of the recommendation and its dependencies. For example, synchronizing and alignment will likely take place in conjunction with the work that's underway to enhance ICANN accountability and that will have impact throughout the various implementation projects. The community can track status and progress of implementation on the ATRT2 program wiki, and updates are being provided on a trimester basis.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Larisa. Ray. Ray Plzak talking about the organizational reviews that are required under the bylaws, in particular the At-Large review.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

BRUCE TONKIN: Who did I skip? Margie, sorry.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. The other review that we're planning for is the first review that's going to look at the impact of the new gTLD program on consumer choice, competition, trust, and innovation. And that review is scheduled to kick off in the third quarter of this year. In preparation for that, ICANN staff has been working to develop metrics so that there's a lot of data available for the review team. The data that we're collecting is based upon the work of the -- of an implementation advisory group that was formed by the community with representatives from the GNSO and the ALAC where they essentially recommended approximately 70 different metrics to look at these different aspects of competition, consumer choice, and trust. Currently we -- we've had interim recommendations that were adopted by the Board. We have a wide economic study and consumer study that's -- that is currently underway. And then the Board of Directors will be looking at the rest of the recommendations to approve the collection of them. I believe that's on the agenda for this -- this week. And so once that is approved, all the final recommendations from the implementation advisory group will be implemented and we'll be gathering that data in preparation for the review later in the year. Next slide, please.

So just to give you a little bit more detail on the surveys that are underway, we're looking at a very wide global survey for -- to look at the perceptions of consumer trust and consumer choice. We've contracted with the Nielsen firm who's currently doing the survey fielding right now to get the -- a sentiment of consumers and to really be able to report on that. And the idea with that is that there will be a benchmark taken to determine the sentiment now and then they'll redo the survey a year from now to see if there's been any change or improvement in the way

that consumers look at consumer trust and choice as it relates to the new gTLD program. And so the -- the slide indicates some of the upcoming milestones. The survey, as I mentioned, is currently underway, and we expect to have baseline data in the second quarter of this year. Next slide, please.

So the other survey that the Board adopted last year relates to an economic study that's going to look at pricing innovation and market practices of new gTLDs. And currently we're in the contracting stage so we can't announce the provider yet, but we will be able to do that soon. We expect that they'll begin their activity immediately, and so that will -- should be kicking off very soon. And again, the same approach that we will create a benchmark right now and then do the same survey a year from now to determine whether the sentiment has changed, whether the competition has changed.

This one's a little bit different in that the data is going to come directly from the registries and the registrars, and there's contracts -- contractual language in the new gTLD agreements where registrar -- registries are required to provide information to help us support the study. Any of this data that will be collected will be anonymized and it's not coming to ICANN. It's going to this third-party provider to be able to conclude the study and to determine, you know, pricing and competition and how -- how -- how to establish the baseline that will be looked on with the follow-up in a year from now. And so the -- the milestones, as I mentioned on the slide, we expect the draft to be in the second quarter of this year. Next slide, please.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay, thank you, Margie. Denise, you want to talk about the reviews? I guess these are the next reviews coming up.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Right. So we'd really appreciate your input on the schedule for the upcoming reviews. So the Affirmation of Commitment of course calls for ICANN to organize reviews of its key commitments every three years. It does not stipulate the exact timing. Three years from when? From when the review team -- the last review team is -- is pulled together? When they submit their report to the Board? Or when the Board actually acts on the review team's recommendations? And so the four completed AoC reviews that you've just heard about have provided valuable input and lessons that we can use to provide, I think, more productive and efficient and effective reviews. So we're looking at some several process improvements that Larisa will outline, and we want your input on the schedule for the next upcoming AoC reviews.

In particular, next up on the docket are the second security, stability, and reliability review and also the second WHOIS policy review. So staff -- the proposed schedule on the table is to use the three-year trigger from the point where the Board has accepted and directed staff to implement the recommendations from the first SSR review and the first WHOIS review. This would put the start of the SSR2 and WHOIS2 reviews at the end of this calendar year. We're proposing to issue call for volunteers in the June/July 2015 time frame and then actually start the review in November/December of 2015. This period would, we believe, allow us to wrap up the implementation from the recommendations of the first review, if we're on track for the actual

ICANN | 52
Singapore

projects, and allows the community a little bit more time to -- to recommend volunteers to serve on these reviews and do the additional preparation necessary to hit the ground running with the start of these reviews at the end of the calendar year.

Something I want to call your attention to, for those of you on the session page on the Internet, take a look at slide 21. So in addition to the competition and consumer trust review and the second SSR review and the second WHOIS review, we have a number of organizational or structural reviews that are teed up, based on the bylaw mandated schedule of reviewing ICANN structures every five years. If we follow the -- the schedule laid out in the bylaws, we're looking at a total of eight reviews in the next fiscal year. So this is something that we want to raise your awareness of and certainly get your input on on whether to proceed with this proposed schedule, whether we want to consider staggering some of the reviews. But in particular, we'd like to hear your opinions on this proposed schedule for the launch of the next SSR2 and WHOIS2 reviews.

So please give some thought to that. I know Bruce will be taking questions and encouraging a discussion as soon as we wrap up these presentations.

With that, I'll turn it over to Larisa to highlight just a few of the process improvements, and again, I would encourage you all to take a look at the slides which contain a lot of more detailed information.

Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: In response to ATRT2 Recommendation 11 to improve efficiency of reviews, process improvement goals have been established and work is progressing to operationalize some of these improvements.

To use volunteer time and ICANN resources efficiently and to add some predictability, schedules and expected time commitment on the part of the volunteers will be made clearly available and included in the call for volunteers.

Timely updates on the progress of implementation work, much like what you've already heard presented here today, will be included in the -- and incorporated into the review cycle, so that by the time that the review team commences its work, those updates are readily available.

Budget information will be provided at the start of each review, to improve planning and maximize available resources.

And then there are several others that are mentioned on the slide that I encourage you to read.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay. At this time, we pass to Ray for the organizational reviews under the bylaws.

RAY PLZAK: Thanks, Bruce.

I'm going to go quickly through these slides.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

One thing to note is that a lot of the things that were just talked about by Larisa are things that we had already started to implement and are some of the characteristics of the current set of reviews.

First of all, from a perspective of organization, I'm not going to go through this whole slide. I do want to point out one thing in particular, and that's the working party.

The last round of reviews, you had an independent examiner and then you had the board appoint a board working group which basically wrote a report about the report that the independent examiner wrote. Kind of a wasted effort.

And the ability of the community to be involved was not that great.

What we've done with the working party -- and when Jen makes her presentation, you'll see that, the effects of that -- is to get the organization that's under review more deeply involved from the standpoint of looking at criteria and actually doing a lot of what one could consider to be the management of the actual process of the review with the assistance and support of staff.

The methods there, a new thing we've done this time is the 360 assessment, and that is something we'll cover a little bit later.

So the review criteria is not invented by the independent examiner. It's given to the independent examiner and we want to make sure it's objective and quantifiable, and there's a -- lists that are continually be developed from which we continue to select these things and put them into the contract with the examiners.

Slide.

This is the five-year cycle. Unfortunately, the triangle is the portion from the last review that never really got around to being done.

So what -- if you look at the review cycle, the first four blocks are three years, and that is the planning for the review, conducting it, planning and -- the implementation and implementing the improvements. That whole piece is three years.

Then there's two years that are there for the unit to actually operate, the organization to actually operate under that review so that you'll be able to, at the end of that period, do some kind of monitoring of effectiveness and so forth, so that you can actually feed into the next review.

So the idea is, get everything done in a short order -- three years -- and then take two years to actually operate under what you've done. And that is something that's new for us.

Next.

This is the review process. There is the review, the report, and the implementation plan. I'm not going to go into the details other than to say that the review is relatively straightforward. As I said, it uses objective criteria. It tries to minimize the time of the community, in that -- through the use of the 360 assessments with some follow-up interviews.

The report. A difference for reporting now is the fact that the independent examiner prepares the report, it goes to the review

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

working party who can then look at it, and besides look at it, they can provide clarifications and actually rebut some things, so that when the final report comes out, it's got that input into it, and of course then we'll go through public comment periods, and then a final report is provided to the board.

The implementation plan. Again, a review working party is involved in that and that's how they get their organization into -- involved, and of course staff supports it.

Slide.

The roles and responsibilities.

I want to point out the one on the left where it says "Structural Improvements committee." That's actually the board, to a certain extent, and it's oversight.

If you were to ask me right now what does the draft report look like, I couldn't tell you, because it hasn't been presented to us yet.

Our oversight to this point in time has been to make sure that the resources are there as needed to do what we need to do to help encourage portions of the review to take place and so forth.

In the end, when the plan -- when the report is presented, it would be accepted, and then the plan, when it's developed, would be approved.

The board will not be participating in the writing of the report and will not be participating in the writing of the plans.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

The other one to look at is the review working party. And you notice there's a lot of things they do. And this is the community, the organization that is under review, doing work and making sure that they have a valid and viable input into the process.

Slide.

And I'll now turn it over to Jen Wolfe and she'll go through the GNSO review and then I guess you're going to give it back to you.

JEN WOLFE: Then I will give it back to you. Thanks.

It's my pleasure to present on behalf of the GNSO review working party on the work that we've conducted to date and the steps that we have ahead of us and the time frame that we're looking at.

Just to be clear, the role of the GNSO review working party is to be the conduit between the professional company, Westlake, who was hired to conduct the review, so we're not conducting the review.

We are actually providing feedback from the community. We are a liaison between the SIC, the Westlake professional providers, and staff, and of course the community.

And so a lot of the work that we've done is to try to listen to what everyone was concerned about, find out what they were looking for, provide feedback, and help to drive the process forward.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

There are three pieces to the review that were conducted by Westlake. The 360 assessment, interviews and the reviews and observation of documentation. So I'll speak just briefly about those -- sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Excuse me a moment. Could you slow down? The interpreters and the scribes are having a little hard time.

JEN WOLFE: Sure. Sorry about that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

JEN WOLFE: Absolutely.   I will definitely slow down.

On the 360 assessment, the purpose of that was to conduct a survey that was a 360. So to find out what does everyone think is happening within the GNSO review.

That is where our working party spent a lot of time to try to drive some discussion about what should the questions be, how could we ensure that we're covering all of the questions, and we were able to provide feedback to ensure that there were both qualitative and quantitative questions. We also spent a lot of time talking about the length of the survey, to ensure that we would receive as much participation as possible, and so we provided feedback that the survey be designed to provide both shorter and longer versions.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And so with that, we found that we had 178 completed questionnaires. 300 of those were started, so there was a 60% completion rate.

The Westlake team also conducted qualitative interviews. There were 35 one-on-one interviews conducted. One of the things that the working party did was try to ensure that as many people as possible were interviewed and that leadership was interviewed in the process.

The Westlake team also will be working its way through document -- documents, transcripts, proceedings, and providing feedback to us on that in their final report.

Throughout this process, we've had 13 working party meetings. There are 20 members of the working party.

In terms of outreach, there have been three Webinars. We've had 14 different presentations, two blogs, two videos, and there were 3,000 brochures to promote outreach.

In terms of engagement, we had 1709 views of the announcements, we had close to 3,000 blog views, and 446 visits to the wiki.

I'll go ahead and give you an update on the next slide with our upcoming steps.

This week, we will be meeting on Wednesday from 10:30 to noon. That will be the first opportunity that we have the -- as the working party have to hear the initial draft report from the Westlake team. This will be our opportunity to provide feedback to them and initially understand what their conclusions were.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

Between now and March 3rd, the working party will have time to review the working text in more detail. At that time, we will have a meeting with the Westlake team and provide our feedback.

On March 20th, the Westlake team will deliver consolidated comments -- or no. I'm sorry. We're delivering our consolidated comments. I apologize.

So between the March 3rd meeting and March 20th, we will be preparing our consolidated comments and providing those to the Westlake team. The structural improvements committee will be updated on April 21st.

Between April 23rd and June 4th, Westlake will then post the draft report out to the community at large for public comment. The community will have the opportunity to provide comments, and an update will be provided on the 19th of June.

ICANN 53 is held the 21st of June through the 26th, and we will be meeting again during that time frame, and the final report will be issued on July 14th.

Back to you, Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Thanks.

Based on what you just heard, here's a look ahead what's happening with the next organization, which is the At-Large.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

We have begun the first phase of it, which is the plan review, and this will take place through the first half of this year.

The review will then be conducted through the first quarter of next year. Then a six- to nine-month period will be set aside for plan implementation, and implementation of improvements will take place through June '17, so that by July '17 through August '19, we will have the two-year period for operating under it. And then between September and December of 2019 we'll be assessing the effectiveness of the process that's been implemented.

I'd encourage you to take some time to read this slide. I went over it very quickly, but this slide, compare it to the five-year cycle that was presented earlier and you'll see how this fits together.

Slide.

This is what Denise was talking about, and this is way overambitious and so there needs to be some serious discussion about this and we need to really figure out what we're really going to do.

The problem you've got is you've got one cycle of reviews running on a three-year time frame, you've got another cycle running on a five-year time frame.

In addition to that, you've got work that's being done by both sets of reviews that overlaps, and so there has to be some work done to do some synergy here to figure out where one could feed the other or actually one does work that is actually then incorporated into the other. There's a number of different options to look at. But that's got to be done because we've got to change this workload.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Larisa is going to go into a little bit more of that -- I think you were next to do that, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ---

RAY PLZAK: Okay. Well, then so I encourage you to take the time to look at that slide and let's come up with some ways of doing it. I've suggested a couple of options that are not necessarily what the real options would be, but let's get the discussion started.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay. Thanks, Ray.

There is a lot of material and obviously a huge number of different types of reviews underway at any point in time and a huge amount of implementation work underway at any time.

Really, the panel's here at your disposal. If anyone has questions on any of the reviews or implementations of those reviews, that would be helpful, or any comments about the timing of the next reviews.

So we welcome any questions.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ---

ICANN | 52
Singapore

BRUCE TONKIN: -- measure the impact (indiscernible) because that does take many years. Even .BIZ and .INFO, for example, which were introduced about 15 years ago, are only now probably starting to be recognized by users --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ---

BRUCE TONKIN: I think what we'll be able to see in the first reviews is more of the supply side so we'll be able to identify, look, how many names have been registered, you know, how many --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Part of the reason -- well, part of the reason for -- Jonathan Zuck from ACT, and I served on the implementation advisory committee, and part of the rationale is actually to get at some factual information via a study that would be difficult to get directly as well.

So pricing is one of the things that came up quite a bit in terms of something that needed to be examined by the review team, and looking at the delta of pricing over that period of time is part of what the purpose of that study was as well.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

So I think it's less about accepting the conclusions of the study and more about that study being a vehicle to put data of some sort in the hands of the review team that's going to happen one way or the other.

It is unfortunate that it's starting as late as it is, but luckily the uptake has not been so great that it's going to be that different.

My concern actually is just that there won't be much of the review left by the time that the second study is done, given the timing. I mean, I -- that's a bigger concern for me. A year out from this study is going to be toward the end of the period of review, and when the final results are going to --

So that's something I think we press ourselves up against way too much is that we're -- you know, don't see the impact of things but we're going to be getting data in when we're supposed to be out for public comment. I think that's going to be a challenge.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yes, please.

FIONA ASONGA: Fiona Asonga. I would just like to propose that probably we look at extending the three-year reviews to be in line with the five-year reviews, because when you look at the Affirmation of Commitment reviews, the third one, the accountability one, needs to look at all the other reviews, and it's not practical, at least from where I stand, to be reviewing reviews that have not yet been completed because you are

ICANN | 52
Singapore

doing reviews on a three-year cycle and another review that you need to probably look into is running on a five-year cycle.

I have proposed before and I'm still going to continue advocating for us to look at our Affirmation of Commitment reviews and extend the period. Even for the institution to be able to implement what is proposed and to give us results of that, then the next review looks into issues of implementation.

Otherwise, we are going to be an institution that is in a vicious cycle of trying to review, and at one point we'll get to a situation where we don't have something to review because everything is a work in progress.

I think we need to look at the amount of time we give to the different reviews so that then it is either or the other SO reviews are happening, the five years, then we have the Affirmation of Commitment later reviews happening on the sixth year or something like that or also taking the same amount of time so that then -- because they're fed from other -- the review process feeds from other reviews.

So if you're running a review that has to feed from other reviews into the shorter cycle, it means you'll be looking at the -- all the previous reviews like twice within your cycle whereas we should be looking at it once and then give it time to -- logically, you look at a review, you give it time for implementation to address the challenges, then you come back to review. Otherwise, what will we be reviewing? What is the AoC reviews going to review? It realistically doesn't make sense. We must just extend the period for the ASO reviews.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you. I guess one of the other concerns, particularly looking at this slide, it says eight reviews within the next year. I believe there was a session maybe just before this session talking about volunteer burnout. Maybe some of the panelists could comment.   But how much engagement are we getting from the broader community on these reviews?

Ray or Jen, did you fill that a lot of people are actually contributing to these reviews? Or does it end up being a very small set of people engaged?

JEN WOLFE: I think we are getting substantial contributions to the extent that we can. You know, I think like many volunteer aspects of ICANN, a lot of people sign up for the group. A few people actually participate. So I think that that's to be expected.

I think we were pleased in terms of the overall outcome in terms of survey respondents. But I think we can do more for outreach and really look at timing of how we are trying to get more people engaged.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks. Ray, do you have any comments on level of participation in the reviews?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

RAY PLZAK: Yes. Just to highlight the fact that it wasn't just the GNSO that was doing the 360 review, it was everybody in all of ICANN. So board members did it. People from the other SOs did it. People from the ACs did it.

There are slides available on the ICANN Web site that show you the participation from different areas. And so when we're saying we got as much as we could, it was as much as we could across the whole organization.

And, granted, it is easy to start one with of these surveys. But as Jen pointed out, there were both long and short ones. And you had the ability to pick which one you wanted to do. It was -- it is always a challenge to get people to do that kind of work. But it is actually much more efficient to do that way and then follow up with specific face-to-face interviews instead of doing it the way it was done the first time where for about two or three meetings in a row you had some guys with clip boards walking around and grabbing people and talking to them.

And so I think that it's better. There's probably a few other ways we could improve that engagement. But I think it was a much better way this time.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, Ray.

One of the other challenges, I know from a board governance point of view, we are starting to want to track fairly closely that the reviews -- the implementation of those reviews is being done properly.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

One of the things is looking at how we engage the review teams a little bit along the journey because what tends to happen is we'll have a review team, comes up with a bunch of recommendations, board then looks at that recommendation, talks to the community. Then the staff do an implementation of that recommendation.

So things can change because this is happening over two or three years' time. And then you create another review team to review the end results which could well be different to the previous review team.

Does staff have any comments on how they engage with the original review team to engage them with some of the implementation work? I will pick any of them. Pick WHOIS. Do you feel you have been able to engage the people that did the original review?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.   That's a great question actually.   So the Affirmation of Commitment reviews are community driven reviews, and the community provides volunteers to serve on these teams.

When the ATRT2 started, their first action was to have a conference call with the first ATRT team to discuss their work and their views on the effectiveness and efficacy of the recommendations and the implementation.

So we expect the next SSR review and the next WHOIS review as well to involve as a first step a discussion with the previous review team.

We also, of course, periodically post the status of implementation of all the various recommendations.   And we keep the initial review team

members in the loop on progress on implementation. So that's a methodology that seems to have worked well thus far.

BRUCE TONKIN: Certainly speaking from the board, we're always welcome to get feedback on how any of those review team members are viewing the implementation and call out any concerns they may have because we are always willing to hear that.

Any other questions? Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the other issue with respect to timeline is: When do we expect a new round of gTLDs to begin? And how does that relate to these timelines? If there's specific recommendations based on CCT, for example, that should in theory affect the next round. Is it going to happen soon enough? Or is the other thing going to happen late enough so that those things are actually related to each other?

BRUCE TONKIN: Would someone on the panel like to respond? Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: I understand the consumer choice review is on the critical path for the new gTLD program. I don't know how, you know -- in practice how that's going to work. You imagine when you have a review team, they go out, they get comment, they have an initial report. Will that factor

into what's going on? I don't know that we've worked out all those details.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't mean to be any more of a trouble maker than normal, I guess. But you just said you recognize it is critical path but you don't know if, in fact, it will be treated as critical path. That's what I think I just heard. So I'm confused by the inherent contradiction there. Is it critical path, or is it not critical path?

I mean, if, for example, there is a lot of things that are coming up right now in the context of particular practices of registries and how they're charging for things and then we are approaching compliance about them and they are saying, Well, they are not actually violating any rules that are set in the guidebook. Okay. That might come out as a result of a review that says these kind of charging practices, the way things are being handled in sunrise, et cetera need to change. Those kinds of recommendations I think would be extremely critical prior to the beginning of a new round, if they're coming up.

So, I mean, to me it feels actually critical path, not theoretically critical path. What am I missing?

MARGIE MILAM: You have to address that to the GDD team because I'm not familiar with their schedule.

I don't know, Bruce, do you have any information on that?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

BRUCE TONKIN: I think my expectation is the same as yours, Jonathan. I don't think the board has any intention to launch another round until the results of the first round have been reviewed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks.

BRUCE TONKIN: Any other questions?

DENISE MICHEL: I have some comments.

BRUCE TONKIN: Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: So, again, I would encourage you to access the slides on this session Web page. There's a lot more detailed information on them. And if you have an opportunity, particularly those of you who are participating in constituency and SO and AC meetings tomorrow, if you have an opportunity to raise this issue and give us any additional feedback you may have on the schedules for the upcoming review, we'd really appreciate that.

Again, we're at the point now where we need to make a decision on the schedule for the next security, stability, and resiliency review and the next WHOIS review team review.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

So we'll be encouraging and collecting any feedback the community has and then coordinating with the board and publishing the schedule for the next upcoming AoC reviews. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, Denise.

Just picking up just on the thoughts on your question, Jonathan, I think one of the challenges will be that I can imagine out of a review you can identify some implementation improvements. So maybe it could be something really simple. It needs to be better information to the community about the launch -- date of the program or maybe there needs to be different formats in which submissions from applicants can be made. So I can imagine it would be a bunch of implementation improvements.

But in parallel with that, I would imagine the GNSO would also be looking to see are there any policy changes they might want to make because as it is, we are just basically implementing the policy from 2008.

So by the time we do all the reviews, that will be probably ten years ago since the original policy was formed. And I know the board has asked a couple of times on different topics, whether its name collision or a few other topics, does the GNSO wish to do policy development on those? And so far they haven't chosen to do so.

But I mentioned there could be a little bit of parallel activity going there between implementation improvements and actual changes in policy.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And the earlier the policy changes are started, the better knowing, as you do, Jonathan, how long it takes to get policy changes.

Done. Excellent. Thank you. Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]