TERESA SWINEHART: Hi, everybody. Are we -- we're sort of ready? Maybe ready? Kind of ready? Excellent. So thanks for joining for this session. This is a really important conversation that has been going on with the community and the org and the board for some time about reviews more generally and streamlining and enhancing the effectiveness of review recommendations and setting a better course with regards to an area of work here.

So with that, I'd actually like to turn it over to Avri and Becky to kick off the session. And again, to thank you for the conversation and this continued dialogue as we try to work towards doing the right thing and adjusting any changes as would be appropriate. So with that, Avri, over to you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Teresa. Okay. So going to basically give a quick agenda on what we're at, which is sort of recapping what Teresa just said. First, we're going to talk about the whole issue of resourcing and prioritization of community recommendations, which is something that we basically have faced over the last year and now we have a great pile of recommendations and we have to figure out how to work through them. So we have a draft proposal that Becky will talk about.

Then after that, we're going to go sort of back in the process and look at reviews themselves and how we time them, how we produce a cadence, how we avoid having too many reviews all happening at the same time. Then we'll go to a discussion and in the discussion, first of all we'll ask the various members, the various chairs of three of the reviews that have been ongoing, either in the last year or still ongoing, get their views on what's represented and then go to those of you that are participating from the other side of the table and get your views on how we can continue in this process. So with that, I'll pass it to Becky.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And thanks, everybody, for being here. We have all noticed that there are this enormous amount of work undertaken by this community that results in recommendations to org or to the board, there are reviews but also cross-community working groups and the like. And we've also begun to realize that we need to deal with the situation where we're getting more and more recommendations. Some of the review teams have recommendations that run into the hundreds or appear that they will run into the hundred. We are in a different economic environment than we were four or five years ago, and there is a need for streamlining the different aspects of the review and then, of course, prioritizing across different community -- sources of community recommendation to make sure that the work gets properly prioritized, planned, budgeted, and implemented.

Cherine published a blog on Thursday, on Halloween, which included a draft paper on prioritization and budgeting but it really focused on one

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL 2–7 November 2019

aspect of that, which is what's an effective -- what are the principles for an effective frame -- an effective recommendations, how can we make recommendations more effective and more actionable and more implementable and how can we streamline the implementation process. There are also, of course, very important substantive work that ATRT 3 is doing with respect to, do we have the right specific reviews, can we combine one, can we drop one, do we need another one, plus other recommendations associated with those -- with their work. And then there's also work that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee is doing and kicked off in a discussion paper in February. So this is sort of the next piece of this. It's all coming together. And what we'd like to do is talk a little bit about the streamlining discussion, initiate the conversation, and begin to solicit community input on it.

So the draft proposal that was -- the paper that was -- it published on Thursday, includes an overview of the proposed principles for effective recommendations, it details -- contains details on how we think that the existing ongoing review teams might test our hypothesis that applying these principles, both in the recommendation development stage and in implementation, might produce better results for all of us. And then a high-level timeline on updating the operating standards for specific reviews.

So principles for developing the effective recommendations, this is just a summary of what's in the paper. There's much more in there, but in the interest of getting into conversation we'll just go through this. We propose, by way of something of a checklist, that the -- when recommendations are being made we should consider, do they address

an observed issue that is -- has a significant consequence for ICANN? Is the -- is the recommendation supported by articulated fact-based findings? Does it address issues and proposed solutions that are within ICANN's remit? Now, I mean, I know that this is all -- this all seems pretty straightforward, you can't propose recommendations that are not within ICANN's remit, but having the check of sort of looking at this and saying have we checked -- have we -- is that -- do we all agree that's right? That's sort of what we're driving at. Does it promote the global public interest in the manner that is set forth in ICANN's bylaws, and this feeds in very nicely and tightly with the work that Avri is leading with respect to developing a framework for considering whether the global public interest is being served.

Is it aligned with ICANN's strategic plan? We have a strategic plan, five-year strategic plan, it's -- it is effective as of the 1st of July. We are all focusing seriously on -- at the board level aligning the board's work, at org's level aligning org's work and asking the community to look at their work to see whether it's aligned. Does it identify a desired outcome and describe how success will be measured? It's an important piece. We're having -- we noticed that as the reviews are working through the recommendations for the previous reviews, has work been completed, have the recommendations been implemented, there's sometimes some disagreements. So the question is, let's agree in advance, if we can, about what -- how you would measure success, how you would measure accomplishment on that.

Does -- does the recommendation come with cost and resources estimates and realistic implementation timelines? And that's

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

important because we think we need to move this into the public comment period on community recommendations. So when community recommendations -- when these recommendations go to the community, we want the community to also comment on -- to also have the information about budget and resource implications and -- and implementation issues as part of the comment process. Does it identify dependencies on the work that's being done in other places. And within the review team or the Cross-Community Working Group, does it establish internal priorities by a given team?

Effective implementation principles, also quite straightforward. Does everybody agree that these -- that the recommendations check all of the boxes on the effective recommendation principles? Do we -- board and org has to ensure that reasonable and appropriate funding is going to be available as part of ICANN's budgetary planning process. Org and board need to be transparent about implementation work and in that we propose to develop a register of recommendations that are in implementation, including cost dependencies, timelines, prioritization and the status so that at any one time, sort of like a risk register, you will maintain an up-to-date recommendation register, which becomes a tool in a couple of different ways. It certainly becomes a tool as part of the budgeting process. It becomes a tool for prioritizing recommendations across the various community work streams, and it also is a -- a tool for assessing our progress.

Board and org need to provide clear and timely updates on the status of implementation issues, flagged developments and the like. And we need a mechanism for the community to have a mechanism to propose

actions for implementation where change is proposed. That last one is very confusing, but what we mean by that is, we need a mechanism so that the prioritization across work streams can be done across the community and then we need a mechanism for saying, this recommendation which is in the register has been overtaken by events or it's been implemented in a different way or the problem has gone away or this recommendation conflicts with the recommendation of something else. There's -- we're skipping a lot of content, but I want to draw particular attention to the parts of the paper that address how the board is going to receive recommendations, engage with the shepherds for the review teams or the leadership of the working groups, to go through the recommendation evaluation process and get to the place where the board recommends -- where the board approves recommendations for budgeting and implementation.

I think -- I'm just going to be very direct here. We all had a pretty unsatisfactory experience with the way the board acted on the recommendations from the Competition and Consumer Trust review. We were surprised and a little caught offguard, and we waited too long to engage so there was a lot of unhappiness and a lot of feeling like the work was not being respected. That wasn't the case. But we could certainly do a much better job by engaging in a conversation with the -- the community on these review teams much earlier on.

So again, I'm going to sort of skip this, but the paper sets out the steps and what happens in each of those steps, and we really want some input on this because we've -- we've been pretty -- we've put out a lot

of steps. It may be that we're overburdening the process, but we were trying to be as clear and precise as possible.

There are a couple of reviews going on right now, specific reviews that are going on right now, and some Cross-Community Working Groups and we're thinking that as part of our conversation about this paper we would ask ATRT3 and SSR2, RDS-WHOIS2, and CCT to consider whether these -- the principles that we've laid out are useful in the work at the stage that they're at. So there are different stages. Obviously CCT is in a very different place from SSR2, but to the extent that we have essentially the ability to test these principles in real time and to the extent, of course, that the community is willing -- the community participants in those work streams are willing to do so, we'd like to ask for their help.

And I think I'm just going to, in the interest of time, go to -- so just timelines on this. We've put the principles out there. We proposed to have a lot of -- to have webinars on this, to have conversations. We've had conversations with the leaderships on the specific review teams who are up here. The paper does reflect input in particular from ATRT 3 because they have very important work in this area and we want to support but not get in the way or duplicate that. But we're going to be looking for input, seeking that, revising the paper, and we hope to be in a position after ICANN67 to move the principles into the operating standards through an amendment process that will include public comments.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. So the next part of this is looking at the timing and cadence of the reviews. Currently the cadence and timing is mandated in the bylaws. Organizational reviews and as the reviews of the SOs and the ACs are slated on a five-year cycle basically with the five-year timing based on when the board receives the final report of the previous review. More predictability and control over the timing, though, is needed, especially because of the contractual relationship with the outside review doing this. So at the moment that is somewhat a predictable part, but some of the other parts are less predictable in terms of their time. The average review phase of around 12 months during the second round. So those have been a little closer than many. The specific reviews are slated to go five years after the previous team was convened. So there's a slight difference in that, although that doesn't really change that much as we're looking at the number of reviews that end up happening at the same time.

ATRT is the only one that has a bylaws commitment that it must be complete within 12 months. The other reviews have a variable length to them. In terms of the CCT, that one is not based on a five-year cycle but is rather based on an interval after another round of new gTLDs is held. So that one has a less predictable cycle. Certainly at the point we don't exactly know when the next round of new gTLDs would be and therefore, it's difficult to predict when the next CCT would be. The bylaws provisions do not discuss or consider how these things are sequenced, how they would go forward.

So here's -- here's a picture of what we have at the moment. And if you'll notice that this -- this is sort of where the next cycle would begin, and

at some point in -- and I really have trouble seeing in this -- in this light, but sometime in '20, I believe it's '20 -- no, it's in 2004, you would find that once again, we might find ourselves in a situation where we would have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, possibly nine reviews all happening at the same time. That is the situation that sort of raised the alarm bells in the last years when all of the sudden we notice that all of these reviews were going on at the same time and it was an incredible strain upon the resources of the members of the community that were participating in them, the members of the community that were being approached with questions and reviews and questionnaires and what have you, and, of course, on the staff members of ICANN org. And it basically created what was considered very much an impossible situation. The org members did manage to survive it. The reviews did manage to go on and either complete or in the process of completion, but it was an incredibly difficult situation that we'd really like to avoid happening again.

So there were too many reviews at the same time. We have an overlap. How do we deal with it? Timing is unpredictable. CCT took two years and eight months to conduct the review. SSR2 is estimated at two years, nine months, and this is excluding the seven-month pause that occurred. And RDS-WHOIS2, two years and three months.

So perhaps you could, you know, say yes, it was predictably between two and three years. That's a very long time. And still there's at least a year's variance in that kind of estimate.

Another problem we've noticed is that the implementation is not always finished in time for the next review to happen. And, of course, that makes no sense. If you're doing a review, you should have time to implement it, you should have time to complete it, you should have time to live with the changes before you start to review again.

So looking at a five-year cycle or looking at the cycle, and these are all the most optimistic estimates we have, it takes about 12 months to plan, initiate, gather together the review teams, et cetera. The review, optimistically let's say it takes 18 months. Again, we've seen that 18 months is an underestimate. It's more been an average of about 30 months. Board consideration at best takes about six months, and that's when we're behaving as efficiently as we can, where there's no duplication of work, where there's no several reviews need to be dealt with at the same time and such. Then there's an implementation that can take between two years and three years or 24 to 30 months, perhaps a little less than three years. And then it takes a half year to a year to assess. So if you take these best guess estimates, these lowest, most optimistic guess estimates, you've got 72 months or 6 years. So we have an estimate of it taking six years to do things that are on a five-year cycle, which is probably not optimal.

Okay. So some of the solutions that we've started looking at, and this work is -- is something that has been being looked at for the last year or two, but is certainly still at a very early stage in its work, is you can change the trigger point. In other words, instead of starting after five years, it starts after N years, to be determined. What triggers it was a final report or is it when it starts or is it after implementation. Is it one

year, two years, not more than two years after implementation? How do you -- how do you trigger it? How do you time it?

Another thing to look -- we've looked at and talked about is, could you limit the time to conduct reviews. In other words, try to limit them all to a 12- to 18-month cycle. I understand from listening to some of the ATRT calls that perhaps 12 months is considered very tight. And if you look at reviews that take two years or longer, to try to limit them to 18 months would be challenging, unless the scope was -- was limited in an equivalent way. So is it possible to limit the time of review? How is it possible to limit the time of review? But that starts feeding into the cycle time. It's easier to limit the scope when the cycle is smaller. If you know that you're going to come back to review again in three, four years, there are things you can put off. If you decide that an optimal scope is six to ten years, well then you're not willing to wait that long to get to it again. So how do you -- how do you deal with the cycle time? Is it increasing it to six years enough with perhaps a shorter review? How does that start to look?

We can certainly speed up the board consideration, speed up the implementation, or at least we could plan on that, and you'll notice that there are a couple of board members here who may have comments on that. We can limit the number of concurrent reviews. We could say that you don't kick off another review until the review that's already in progress has been going on a couple of times -- a couple -- you know, it has reached a certain stage.

Now which of those would work, which combination of those would work? All of these, by the way, would probably require -- in fact, would definitely require bylaws changes. So what do we do here? It's really still a very big question mark. Then we have here -- and this is an illustration of a potential review timeline. I don't want anybody to get the idea that this is in any way decided. What the org staff decided to do was to help us by creating a couple of models and putting pictures to them. So if we were to say it was an 18-month limit with a six-year cycle, you know, what does it look like? But we would still end up with a little bit of parallel, several reviews coming at the same time.

Now, one of the things I want to mention on this slide is we understand that ATRT is looking at whether we need all of these reviews and other -- and the conditions that effect them. In terms of the board's analysis at the moment, we're doing an analysis based upon what exists, not what might exist, but there's a certain amount of hopeful optimism that, you know, something will come out of ATRT that may actually help. And one could look at this, when one was building models, and say review A, review B, review C. So even if the notion of what reviews we do changes, if there's more than a couple, we'll still have the same issue of cycling and amount of time it takes.

Another picture that was drawn is if we limit duration and avoid overlap and basically are intentional about you don't start another review that's in its early stages until you've finished the early stages of previous ones. So this is basically another picture. I don't want to spend a lot of time going through these, but basically the notion is we're trying to model some of the possibilities that we've got.

So now I'm going to go for reactions, we've got -- and of course open to questions. We'll be coming to questions from all of you after this.

We don't -- I don't believe we have a CCT, but we do have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Pat Kane from ATRT3. We've got Alan Greenberg from the RDS WHOIS2, and we've got Russ Housley from SSR2, and we've basically, you know, given them a couple minutes each to basically give us their thoughts on both the periodicity, both the cycling, the streamlining of reviews and perhaps also on the first points that were discussed in terms of the prioritization of how we deal with the -- with the outcomes of reviews with the recommendations and suggestions that they may have.

And I guess I'll go in the order that we have here. So who from ATRT3 would like to go first? I said your name first, Cheryl, so would you like to go first?

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Sounds like a plan, Avri. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. First of all, thank you for this opportunity, and thank you for allowing us as all of the review team leaders to look into this paper and see where there is sort of a likelihood of things (indiscernible) with thinking, at least, from the ATRT point of view.

I don't think either Pat or I will be brave enough to start saying what will believe may or may not come out in our reporting and our recommendations because we're only at the point in our work where

we're deeply contemplating that. But what we can probably say -- and Pat will go into the details; I'll just do the fluffy stuff on top -- is that there weren't too many things that gave us pause, deep concern when we looked at the identification of issues, and even some of the potential solutions that were suggested in this paper. It's a great platform for us to start -- note the "us" here -- our discussion with the community. Note that as well, please, because I think it does need to be a very inclusive process. So hopefully this is the first step in a short journey but as important one.

Without predicting what ATRT3 may or may not be recommending, what is noteworthy is that there are a number of pain points that you've identified, which is exactly what we've heard from the community and exactly what we will be considering as well. So that's enough fluff from me. Let's get to the serious stuff from Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. And I, too, would like to thank you the Board and the opportunity that weighed in on this draft proposal. I think it's helpful in the discussions we're having within ATRT3.

When we think about the reviews and they can look at the reviews, the ATRT3 probably has a consensus on reviews that are a problem and reviews are issues. We clearly do not have a consensus within the ATRT3 as to resolve them. And many of the ideas that we're kicking around and discussing, Avri clearly outlined in the presentation. But when we think about the -- the review of the previous review team's recommendations, part of the challenge, and I'll (indiscernible) some

stats that came out of our own assessment, is that of all of the ATRT2 recommendations, of which -- what -- that we received from ICANN staff, said all 100% were done, the assessment that we made was that 53% had been complete and 18% had been not completed at all and everything else in between had had some form of partial implementation.

Now one of the questions that comes out of that is if after six years, 47% of the recommendations haven't been completed, why is nobody screaming and hollering; right? That's one of the questions that I've got.

So there ought to be a process and a way for us to be able to say it's okay to retire a recommendation we're never going to get to. So are we making too many recommendations? Are they not distinct enough? Are they overcome by events? And that's okay but we should retire them. But we shouldn't claim credit about them being done when they're not actually being complete.

And so since we have been having a conversation that reviews our both pieces and both halves of that, it probably should be -- and Avri in the document mentioned shepherds. There's probably an opportunity for review teams or review team members to continue past the actual delivery of the document such that we can have intent. You know, what is the intent of the recommendation. Because, quite frankly, one of the things we've struggled with with ATRT3 is going back six years from now and saying, hey, Brian, what did you mean? You know? What were you

trying to get at from this particular recommendation. And that was under AoC, and the world has changed in six years.

So when we think about that, there has got to be a process to add to the document and thought process here as to how to retire recommendations that we're never going to get to based upon budget, based upon change, based upon priorities.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. CCT is basically not at the panel. I guess we go to RDS/WHOIS2.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Avri. I'll start off also by thanking you. Some of this discussion should have been held long, long ago.

Prioritization is a good thing, and there are huge variations in the recommendations that come out of our various groups in terms of quality, in terms of importance, and in terms of consensus. I sometimes hypothesize what would happen if we had to approve a recommendation by a secret ballot instead of in front of our friends who we don't want to make unhappy? I think the results would be very, very different in many cases.

You know, I've certainly seen in many cases recommendations that go all the way to the Board because one person want it and no one else wants to fight them enough.

Talk is good. A lot of the recommendations that you have here is people should talk to each other and we should have interactions. I think that's marvelous. You know, we all have a long history of throwing documents over brick walls and someone throws a response over six months later, and this is much better.

However, individually, all of these are good ideas. When you put them all together, I question what this is going to do to overall timelines. You're adding a lot of sequential steps into this process, each of which will slip for the best of possible reasons, and what are we doing to this overall process? Is it really going to be manageable?

So as good as -- as much as I support all of the details, when you put this whole thing together, we may end up with a beast that is something that we can't handle because of the timelines.

In terms of the timelines and cadence, can we go back to the slide which shows the new -- the new version that might happen. Okay.

No, no --

AVRI DORIA: It's a model of what is possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: A model, a model. That's fine.

First of all, I understand the impact on MSSI, on the staff of multiple reviews at one time. But the impact on the community of specific

reviews where we expect everyone to comment on this periodically and things and everyone to contribute to them via versus organizational reviews, is very different. The organizational review is just impacting one part of the community at a time.

Moreover, if you look at the specific reviews, I know we talk about continuous improvement, but if you look at the specific reviews, the implementation, aside from perhaps a few shepherds on the community side, is being done by staff largely. So there's only -- only the dark-blue parts is where the community is very actively involved.

The specific reviews are something different. It's the same people who are participating in the review and then implementing it. And, you know, you've got to let people get off the treadmill periodically and let them do the work they're here for instead of just improving.

So I'm really worried about that kind of timeline where each individual line looks like there's a never-ending path from one to the other.

I guess that's largely my overall comments. I will comment that the number you have for the RDS review is incorrect. The actual timeline the review took was 20 months. There is some history we can explain offline of why the numbers look larger, but it was 20 months.

AVRI DORIA: 20 months is a good number. Thank you for the correction.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's better than two and a half years, which is what we're showing.

AVRI DORIA: Understood. Okay. Thank you.

And I'll now go to Russ Housley who has got the SSR2 which has been -- which has had a very interesting history, partly, with the pause, but beyond the pause, what do you think?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you for the opportunity to share that.

So one of the things that the team has done is adopted many of the suggestions you had already put forward, trying to make sure that all of the recommendations we have are aligned with some element of the strategic plan. If it wasn't aligned with the strategic plan, we've already thrown it off the raft.

We, our own selves, have tried to make sure that they are already fact based and significant and almost all of those things you listed. However, we have made no attempt and will make no attempt to cost or resource. We don't think that's a thing the review team should be doing. That's the whole point in the cycle that's laid out in the bylaws is for that to come during the six months that it's with the Board.

However, we do want to make sure that whatever change is made, we don't lose track of why we're doing the review in the first place.

So when I think back to the IANA transition and the huge long discussions about accountability mechanisms, the review teams, in particular the specific review teams, were a key element of that. And

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

then there was a whole discussion about how to spill the entire Board. We called that the nuclear option at that time because we knew we never wanted to use it.

So that leaves the real accountability mechanism as the specific reviews. So let's make sure that whatever change that we do is ones that continue to promote the accountability. And so that's why I think that the costing and resourcing needs to come later in the cycle.

I would propose, instead of what the Board has proposed, that no implementation happen in the same budget that the review team finishes. Instead, the Board should take the recommendations, do the costing, and say they will all be considered in the next budget. That way -- or all the approved ones go into the budget process. Then the entire community can look at the cost. One the Board can stand behind because staff has helped estimate it. And everything else that is on the budget, and do the proper prioritization with community review. That, I think, supports the accountability that we're looking for instead of the proposal that the Board put forward.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And thank you very much for doing that. Of course, that would also lengthen the cycle between them, I would assume.

I would like to -- shortly going to go to the -- to you folks sitting out there. I hate using the word "audience." It's the participants in the seats that aren't these.

But I also want to ask if any of the board members up here who are either on the OEC committee, the operational effectiveness, for want of a better term, or the various review caucuses had anything they wanted to add at this point. As you guys are getting ready to question, here are a bunch of possible questions for discussion, but any question you've got about this, any comment you've got about this would be valuable to us in terms of how we move forward, what kind of next steps we take.

Did anybody want to comment from you folks?

No? Okay.

Anybody have any questions, comments? Please, I think come to the microphone is probably the best way to do it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hi, my name -- can you hear me? Yeah.

AVRI DORIA: Yes.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm with the GNSO and I had participated in two reviews for the GNSO and have the privilege also to co-chair the implementation team of the last GNSO review.

From that experience -- so we had also almost used the four to five years to implement the recommendations and to end the review.

Also, we didn't have the structural part of the reviews. It was taken off from the beginning. So it took us, just for that part, for the review, four or five years, which is a long time.

I think the -- all is dependent on the review itself, the implementation of the words. So you can only follow what been has recommended and so on.

The what I am -- And looking back, what I am missing is, from the beginning, more guidance, let me say, or ideas coming from the Board how to guide us through that -- through these -- through these reviews. But what I wanted to say is we start a review. The Board gives us support and ICANN gives us support in providing us funds, for example, and with an independent advisor. so and then the community is going on to do the work with the independent advisor.

However, I think from time to time it's necessary that a kind of management is looking to what is going on and giving some directions to that in terms of -- maybe in terms of content, but especially in terms of time cycle and keeping the time. Otherwise, so we ended as we ended, so we came up with recommendations after two and a half years, and then we started to implement or to set up an implementation team which has, then, to learn about the recommendation again if these are not the same people doing the recommendations. So when it comes to implementation, you have to review what is behind these recommendations, so and we have to really to discuss that. There is a lot of time to be spent for that.

What is essentially and what was very helpful was that we had very good staff supporting us for the implementation. They had a structural -- a structure of kind of leaflets to prepare for the implementation so that we could understand what is behind the recommendations. However, it took time, as I said, really for the implementation team from time to time to understand what the recommendation means and how -- and then draw the -- their own ideas how to implement that. So there is something which could be improved in this regard.

And coming back, what I said from the beginning is I would say I would like to encourage the Board here, looking to the timeline to set a timeline, or to give us an idea of a timeline, let me say it, rather than to wait for feedback from the community, where we will come back every time with five or six years, I'm sure.

So if that is not done in a kind of guidance way, so we will stay as is.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

Did anyone wish to comment? On that, to add anything? I don't see anybody wishing to.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: I just want to admit I'm typing it down under a title "other good ideas for ATRT3." So I'm stealing your ideas that will be blatantly used in discussion.

AVRI DORIA: Actually, I think that's wonderful since ATRT is the group here with the responsibility of looking at all these and coming up.

Yeah, sort of surprising in a little way of sort of having more strict guidelines going into review as opposed to sort of the philosophy that we've sort of had is there's the bylaws, there's the review team, and then there is sort of the independence of the review to sort of set its own course with a statement that perhaps it's better to have more guidelines than fewer, which is something that would not have necessarily have occurred to me. So I very much appreciate it. Thank you.

Yes, please.

BECKY BURR: I was very interested in the view, the perspective from SSR2 on the not wanting to do pricing and costing as part of that. And I wonder if we could talk about that a little bit more and get views from other folks on the -- on the panel about it.

I guess just by way of background, our thinking was a little bit you need like information when you are doing the prioritization sort of across -- when you are responding to the recommendations, that seems like useful information. But if you would talk a little bit more about why you took that position, that would be helpful.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. There are other review team members in the room who could certainly come to the mic as well.

But the people that are on the team are -- they have a lot of skills that are emerging as very useful in doing the review. But I don't think that -- I mean, we know which ones are little and which ones are big, and that's what you need to do the prioritization.

But coming up with too fine a point on that I think leads to, "Oh, yeah, you were way off on that" and that isn't the point of the review team or the recommendation.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Alan wanted to make a comment, and then I will go back to the line. So thank you for your patience.

Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think having -- I certainly wouldn't want to recommend the review team do costing. But having access to costing, having it done by staff, I think, is very important. There are a number of reasons. The review team is likely capable of saying, Well, if it's really going to cost that much, it's probably not worth it or they might even elevate it because the cost is low. But there's another aspect to it. It's sometimes very hard, especially when you're trying to be concise and clear to make sure you get your message across. And I've certainly seen over the history a number of times where a cost estimate comes in and it's huge. And we

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019
66

knew in our gut this was not a big project, and it was misunderstood and overscoped. And heaven help us if someone would go away and actually spend that money and implement it when that wasn't what we had in mind. So cost estimates both help you set priorities or decide to scrap something altogether and also are a sanity check that we're both talking the same language.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

Pat and then Sebastien. Apologies again, Sebastien.

PAT KANE: So, Alan, I think you're right. Does the costing help us make a determination whether it's a good idea or not? The review team is supposed to focus on what's impactful in terms of recommendations that we implement within the community. And some of them may be rejected by the Board or assigned to the GNSO's policy development process. And to put that as part of a factor that the Board weighs, I'm not sure I would want the Board to weigh that in terms of whether the recommendation is a good recommendation or not.

And once you get those priorities, I think at that point in time we should have them costed out to say whatever the prioritization process becomes and some of the recommendations that we have, that that is how we weigh and prioritize those items because it may be that we get

one good project in one year and that's the best thing that we can possibly do. But whatever that prioritization process is ought to be based upon the costing, not the value of the recommendation before that, I think.

I think that's kind of in line of what you were thinking, Russ. Is that right?

AVRI DORIA: Actually, I would prefer to go to the list. But I'll come back for further conversation. But they may have something to add to this conversation. So please.

Yes, I know. Thank you, Russ.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Giving you plenty of time to put your headphones on. I'm sorry for bothering you with this. But I gather since we have interpreting services, we better use them. Otherwise, there's no point in having them in the room.

I struggle a bit to understand what's going on here in this session. When I submitted my application to participate at the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, I thought it would be a team that would review reviews, precisely. But today the Board comes here with plenty of new ideas, which I appreciate, but is it really within its remit to do that today?

So I have a very radical suggestion to make today. So thank you, Board, for presenting all this information to us regarding this third accountability and transparency review. We're going to put them to good use, I can assure you. But you already know me and you can't blame me for doing this, but I will add here something more and that is that the second part of the implementation -- it's hard for me to think in French because I tend to think in English about things.

But Work Stream 2, the ATRT's work following the IANA transition should actually be under way. But given that we're all lacking resources, I don't understand why the Board hasn't focused on that aspect rather than leaving this work to our review team. I apologize for being a bit provoking and dissatisfied with what is going on, but this is just me being me. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I have to take that out of my ear in order to speak.

Thank you very much, Sebastien.

I think part of it is we have been working on some of this stuff in various committees for a long time and we wanted to bring them to where ATRT could, indeed, take what we have done and gone further with it.

The first part is we have various reviews that -- and not speaking of Work Stream 2. I know you're on the Work Stream 2 implementation team, and we've had that discussion. And that work is also ongoing.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

And we have a fair number of recommendations now that need to be budgeted and implemented, and so we're really trying to figure out the answers to all of that.

You may have more to add to what I just said.

BECKY BURR: So we absolutely agree that Work Stream 2 -- the implementation -- there's been work going on about it. We think it's going to move into a new phase and, it is a priority. It's a priority in the bylaws as well. So in some ways, it's not quite in this bucket.

But I think -- and we certainly do not propose to duplicate or impinge or constrain the work of ATRT3 or its remit.

And, frankly, you know, the more work ATRT3 does on this, the happier we will be. We were looking at sort of a universe of community recommendations, not just the specific reviews. Although I agree that those are our critical piece of accountability. But we do have the organizational reviews and we have cross-community inputs and even some policy development stuff that's going on.

And, frankly, a significant part of this was prompted by the Board saying, How can we be more effective in receiving and evaluating and responding to and approving or rejecting the community recommendations?

And that is work that ATRT3 may have insights and views on. But it doesn't have to have insights and views on them. And I think that we probably need to clean up our act a little bit in the meanwhile.

AVRI DORIA: Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Jordan Carter, .NZ. I will start by saying I'm not an expert in ICANN's review processes and that's why you get feedback from somebody who isn't because this is a multistakeholder community, not an expert community.

The point I guess I want to make is the Board blog post talks about a continuous improvement process, and there's nothing continuous about this improvement process except that it's happening all of the time. The idea the specific reviews drop in every six years and are part of a continuous improvement process, it's just impossible. It's not plausible. It is not continuous.

And so if the idea is to make ICANN an organization that engages in continuous improvement, these reviews are not the answer. So they must be the answer to some other question. Nothing that's been said tells me what that other question is. It looks like a make-work job for a bunch of familiar faces.

So one of the kind of questions overriding this is: Who in the system has responsibility for making ICANN the kind of organization that can

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

continuously improve? Is it the Board? Because if it is, I think maybe a bit more thought into how this could work would be useful.

This looks like a useful incremental evolution of the very complicated and overcooked review process that we've already got.

But it doesn't look like it makes it something that's ready for the 20th century, let alone the 21st.

BECKY BURR: So a couple of responses. I think one of the biggest sources of where -- how we get to continuous improvement is ATRT. I think that is -- that's a big part of it.

We're also looking at the question with respect to the organizational reviews. That's an ongoing discussion that we launched in February. And I think -- I'm not going to disagree with you on that. We need to find a way to get there.

This is true this is attacking one part of the problem, which is can we make the recommendations more effective and more actionable? But there's a lot more work around this to be done.

And the question is: Are the reviews the right way -- reviews the way they are structured the right way to do it? In significant part, that's an ATRT3 question. And we're looking to hear from them on that.

AVRI DORIA:	The only piece I would add to that is the reviews are what we have now and we're trying to figure out how to use them.
	Until ATRT has actually recommended a change to them, they're the system we have to try and make work. And at some point -- I don't know if anyone else would like to add something to that. No? Okay.
	Please, next.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Hi. This is Lauren. I'm one of the SSR2 vice chairs. I want to talk quickly about the time resources and then a quick note on accountability. So the first thing, limiting the amount of time for review sounds problematic to me for the following reason: The review team cannot and does not control a lot of the things that have to happen for us to do our reviews. For example, we in SSR2 had to ask questions to ICANN org: You know, what are you doing about X? We then have to wait for these answers to come back and that were delays that we just had to deal with. So essentially if a review asked difficult questions, it takes a long time to answer them or whatever else. They would run out of time.
	Second point, resources. That also interacts obviously with time. And here I have to say the resourcing has to be in line with what is asked of the review team. So, for example, less time, we'll need more resources to be completed just as an example.
	Pricing recommendations, similar problem. If we're supposed to price a recommendation, we need as a review team a little insight that at least in our case, we did not have to the extent that we could actually

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

even assess, Okay, where is ICANN standing right now in relation to this. And, you know, what has to be done to get to a point that we consider appropriate. We cannot price it because we don't know.

In addition, we would also have to have, again, appropriate resourcing, we get support or whatever to actually do this.

I think Alan's example was actually a pretty good one.

If we had a feedback mechanism where we could get back something along the lines of recommendation X will cost Y and then we can say, Okay, if it's that expensive, we can, you know -- we don't care as much about it anymore. It's a resource problem.

And I think changing all this stuff about the reviews, one really has to think about what needs to be put into the reviews for them to remain functional. And then I think on accountability, I just want to say these reviews are a key element of ICANN accountability and maybe we shouldn't just think about what the reviews do in terms of recommendations but also that they are the only thing that provides oversight more or less. And that is a value in itself. Thank you. Sorry for talking so long.

AVRI DORIA: No, no, thank you very much. We're not doing a timer.

Just to say whenever I try to explain these reviews to everyone, I call them the bottom-up oversight of ICANN. I very much buy into that notion that not only are they important for accountability but, indeed,

they do provide that notion of bottom-up oversight that's so essential for us to be a free-standing organization without external oversight. So thank you very much for bringing it up and for giving me an excuse to say that again --

I don't know if anyone else wanted to add a comment.

Yes, Pat. Oh, okay. Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two sentences. Point is it's by the community but the customer is also the community. That's why I think the costing being done before it goes into a budget so that the prioritization is done by the community is a better answer.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. And Pat?

PAT KANE: I think the piece I would address is the time binding. I mean, I think when you take a look at ATRT2, they had one year to do their work. And six years later 50% of the recommendations aren't done. So, you know -- so even when you time bind, then -- so -- I think the time binding is really important at least from how we have thought about this, is to take a look at what our scope is because we saw ATRT2. We saw the CCT RT results. And where can we put most of our energy? And we have five areas we are very specifically focused on. And quite interestingly enough it seems this week is around prioritizational reviews, and those

are our top two priorities. We are struggling -- I shouldn't say "struggling." That's not the right word. We have not achieved consensus.

But we are passionate about how to make ICANN more accountable and be more transparent, but are we doing the things that are the most meaningful? And can we take a look at reviews, streamline them, reduce costs so that we can actually get more work done with other resources? And so there's all kinds of things that work together here.

And I think that we're finding the time binding is a challenge for us, trying to meet on a regular basis because several of us have other jobs and getting married and having kids. So, you know, there's lots going on.

But it also forces us to think about what's the most relevant and important contribution we can make to the recommendation process.

AVRI DORIA: Can I ask, like time binding, you mean the fact you have a 12-month limit? I just wanted to make sure I had the term correct.

PAT KANE: One year.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, okay. I just wanted to make sure that's what "time binding" meant.

I also have Alan. Please, you had a quick answer?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, I just had a quick answer on the time binding. And this is exactly what I'm saying. If you want to be quick, you have to think about how can you resource this group in a way that allows them to get done. And that is where the problem lies.

AVRI DORIA: While you are trying to get other work done, exactly.

Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two very quick comments. For the record, ATRT2 in theory had a year. In fact, we had about 9 1/2 months because we didn't start early but we were told we had to finish on time.

My concern with the number done is not really at all that all of them weren't done. I think that's a reasonable outcome. My real concern is staff considered them done. That's the problem, that somebody who is consulting at their job evaluating is this work done ticked it off, when in some cases as you noted nothing had been done. I find that far more problematic than not getting the work done.

PAT KANE: Alan, I agree with you. Unless you have a process that allows you to deliberately dispose of the recommendations, you have no choice but

either to do them or not do them and that's -- I think that's where we ended up. But if you were to say, for whatever reason, this is no longer applicable to what we're trying to achieve, let it die.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I have no problem ending the implementation with some red Xs saying it wasn't done. It's the honesty of the evaluation that I worry about.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Please.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Susan Kawaguchi. I was on the WHOIS review team -- the first WHOIS review team and then currently vice chair on the RDS review team.

And I saw a remarkable difference in resources and planning and expectations from within ICANN org between those two review teams. I felt that was much -- our work was much more organized. We had a lot of resources we needed.

I appreciated the fact that we had a budget and we came under -- in under budget which we were proud of, you know, because any time you are spending somebody else's money, you want to be very critical about how that's spent. So I have seen a lot of improvements between those two time periods.

What I see in this -- and I haven't read your document in depth, but I was on the call the other day and I've read it at a high level. I really see this impacting some of the things you're asking for here, and I think the previous gentleman also said this, was -- this is really going to impact ICANN staff.

And they're going to have to be very critical of -- a wide variety of ICANN staff members would have to be in the trenches with the review team to actually speed up the process and get the answers we need. And I don't do finances, not my job, and I would never want to be responsible for costing. That is just -- that would go way beyond my expertise.

So I think it's good to have a reality check. We checked in with Chris Disspain who was on our team and said what do you think these recommendations -- do you think these recommendations are feasible? I think it's good to ask all of those questions, but at the end of the day, ICANN Board members and ICANN staff are going to be highly impacted on this. So, you know, that's fine if that's what the community and ICANN org decides on, but I think you should recognize that, you know, board members -- I mean, review team members come with an expectation of spending a certain amount of hours volunteering but the rest are all paid resources. So -- and to be effective, we need effective resources.

The other thing that -- you know, I'm not too worried about how clumped up these review teams have become. I think that will stretch out, even out over the years. To me it came out of the IANA transition. Hopefully we don't have another transition. I don't know what that

would be, but, you know, so I think these will spread out naturally. We're just having to deal with this now. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. There was one thing I just wanted to throw in that hopefully will be better in terms of marking completions in the future and that's sort of the question that started asking us, what does it mean for this to be completed. I think that very often when someone gets a review and then five years later is trying to determine whether it was complete or not, it is very difficult and it -- you know, I didn't say that before, but I wanted to add that. I think you're very right about the resourcing. In fact, I, you know, look over at the staff every once in a while and see how they feel about hearing about resourcing and such. But yeah, you're right.

But the point is, I think it's already using a lot of resources and are they being used rationally? Are they being used as well as they can. So hopefully we can figure that part out while we're doing all of this. Did anyone else want to comment before I go to the next person in line? Please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Good afternoon. My name is Kristy Buckley. I served as lead examiner for the recently completed ccNSO review. And we did use some principles in our review, but they're a bit different in nature given our role as an external examiner. I'm happy to share those, if that would be

helpful. But in the meantime, I wanted to offer a few observations on the draft principles for developing recommendations.

So first observation is that some of the current draft principles may be susceptible to subjectivity. So Avri, your framework on interpreting what does it mean for something to be in the global interest is helpful to ensure a more objective application for some of those.

Second observation is that it would seem like the design and the engagement of reviews should also take into account these principles, not just when recommendations are being developed. For instance, if a large proportion of findings or challenges identified in a review don't meet the principles when it comes to developing the recommendations, this could cause some cognitive dissonance in the community.

Number three, I would say that one of the more resilient aspects of the multistakeholder model, from my outside perspective, is the pursuit of continuous improvement. And so ensuring connectedness of continuous improvement actions could help ensure alignment and efficiency. So there's lots of recommendations out there and figuring out, you know, which ones are where, where there's overlap, where there's similarities, how you move it forward.

And then on the fourth question here on the slide, in your experience what makes an effective recommendation, I just wanted to offer from our recent experience in the ccNSO, I would say that solutions that come from the community itself that have some degree of buy-in are the most effective. Because it's not your own agenda as reviewer that

you're pushing forward or your own idea. It's, here's a challenge we have identified, what do you think as a community member is a way to address that and then elevating that as a recommendation. I wanted to share that. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much. Great to see you. And very much appreciated the comments you also submitted into this were helpful. Did anybody wish to comment, question? No. Thank you very much. Thanks. Please.

JACQUES BLANC: Yes. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Jacques Blanc. I've had the pleasure to be a part of the ATRT3 team. I'm going to be very brief. Just we might want to remember some kind of an old stage joke and producing joke that we have says, "In everything we produce, we can do cheap, we can do fast, or we can do quality. Pick two of those."

AVRI DORIA: That keeps going in the back of my mind. In fact, I think I've told several people that one over the last week. I think will be the last comment from there, and then I want to give everybody that's up here a chance to comment. So please.

TOM BARRETT: Tom Barrett, chair of the NomCom review. And my observation, we have 27 recommendations. Many of them are common sense. Let's do

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

some training, let's publish job descriptions, et cetera. Some of them are more overarching changes to how the nominating committee works. But one of the most exciting recommendations is a mechanism for continuous improvement, so that we don't need to wait another five years to improve the NomCom. So we actually have a mechanism in place that will be essentially a standing committee that will help the nominating committee continuously improve from year to year.

So I know we're stuck with this structure during reviews but maybe one suggestion for every review is that they establish a mechanism for continuous improvement and so that it continues throughout the -- each cycle. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I had said he was last, but you got in line quick enough. So if you've got a really quick comment, but you really, really are the last one.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: My name is Naveed. I'm a member of the SSR2 review team. So I just believe that without investigating into which -- what is going wrong with the current review process, just extending the timeline won't produce anything. So unless we see what is problematic, we have the staff liaison, we have even board liaisons with all of these reviews and even after them, they are not finishing in time or exceeding the expectation of the time limit, unless we -- we need a review of this review process itself. Like, what is going wrong there, before we can

just extend or think about something else. I also believe that portraying the timeline, especially for SSR2, that it is around two years and nine months, what I see is not a kind of a right interpretation of what happened because of pause and all that and we lost half of the members and we have to restart. So given that I think that the review team has done tremendously well in coping up with all the time, given that we just started in August 2018 until now, we have just have the draft recommendations. I just wanted to highlight this. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Certainly was not being at all critical. We were just basically trying to do time. But the two month, nine did exclude the seven month. But that's beside the point. Last thing before I go to the people up here and see who would like to comment is that one -- I think the comment was, you are stuck with what you've got. And indeed we have what we've got but then again we look at both the ATRT 3 to help us get unstuck, and it's certainly the process that both, you know, Becky and I and the other board members have been involved in in terms of looking at this overall thing of all the kinds of reviews and all the kinds of implementation after we get the reviews and such to try and get it unstuck, to take what we've got and figure out how we move forward with it because it is -- it's critical, it's the bottom-up oversight, and yet we can't let it interfere with actually doing the real work that ICANN has to do on actually substantive issues. So how do we get that proper balance. Who -- I have been holding you off. You wanted to say something a while back and I never got to you, so would you like to take

the first crack at sort of a closing set of thoughts for the moment and then I'll go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I have no idea what I might have wanted to say before, so that's water under the bridge. A couple of comments. The comment on continuous review I think -- continuous improvement I think is relevant. When the At-Large was going through its trying to get its last review approved, a number of people, including several board members who are no longer on the board, said, we will not start any more organizational reviews until we take a good look at this and decide are we doing something rational, are we doing it right, do we need a real change, and yet I'm hearing we're just about ready to start GNSO 3. I don't -- I hope the first one stands and we will sometime have a substantive discussion on what organizational reviews are worth and are we doing them the right way. Because I believe, for many reasons, the answers are no, we are not doing them the right way. They are not worth what we're spending. So I hope we'll have that discussion someday.

I've been working in ICANN now for 13 years and I've been working in the industry for something over 50 years. One of the things you note very quickly is there is a pendulum effect. Things swing back and forth. Things are en vogue, then they go out of vogue, then they come back en vogue. What I'm seeing in ICANN with the organizational reviews in some cases is an organizational review comes in and says, let's make a change. And we make that change. Then seven years later someone

says, let's make a change and in fact what they're recommending is going back to the first version. And we go back and forth. We don't learn from any experience because the people turn over. And I think for organizational reviews we have to really think about what we're doing and the concept of continual review and periodic checks but not necessarily some massive review with recommendations I think is a direction we might want to think about going to. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Just a quick thing on the GNSO review. It's in the bylaws that it will need to happen, but we are trying to maintain the not -- you know, not until we understand what we're doing. So we have that contradiction there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unlike specific reviews which have an absolute timeline, the bylaws for organizational reviews have wiggle room for the board.

AVRI DORIA: I hate using wiggle room. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah, just to say briefly that this has been very, very useful input and it's great to have had the ongoing engagement of members of the community that sat up here.

This effort by the board is not intended to be or was never intended to be seen as anything that's usurping or as a substitute for the

community activity and action in this regard. More you should take it as a reflection of our concern that we share your concerns about the amount of work that is overall community that ICANN has to do. And I think -- and how do we make that more effective? How do we lessen the burnout and other things that we continually talk about and do have to address. So see this effort from the board as -- in that context.

And then finally, I think a couple of people touched on it. I think, Pat, you said it really well. This is not just about timing and cadence, right? This is a much bigger issue. And what we've talked a little bit about is parts of that so far. But it's a -- it's a -- we have to take a holistic view of this. Otherwise, we won't be able to address it in a very effective way. So we have to think beyond our boundaries, and I just want to leave with you that thought. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Would anyone else like to -- nodding your head means you would like to say something.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

AVRI DORIA: Lito does. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you. I just want to add something. I've heard many concerns which I share regarding this whole aspect of the reviews streamlining and reviews recommendation and I -- I think the recommendation of the priority session, not the recommendations within each review, has to be done after we get the custody and so on by the same review team because they -- they are more aware of the impact of the recommendations. But I think maybe some have touched on that and I would like to make -- to emphasize, when it comes to dealing or prioritize among the recommendation from several review teams that would impact the budget, so we don't have -- at least as far as I know -- a body, a something or mechanism to deal with the cross review recommendation priority session. So I think we need to think about that.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Lito. Another comment? Yes, Pat.

PAT KANE:

I think I'd just like to add to one of the things Tom Barrett said about the NomCom reviews. They have 47 recommendations.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

27.

PAT KANE:

He said 27. That's still a lot, right? And one of the things that we'll see with ATRT 3 is that because of the new operating procedures, we will

have recommendations but we'll also have suggestions and strong suggestions in terms of how we look at some of the commentary that we're making. And, you know, my expectation would be that suggestions and strong suggestions get rolled into work efforts as they make sense to be picked up and added to other work efforts.

AVRI DORIA: I saw that I and thought that was a marvelous innovation that you guys --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

AVRI DORIA: Yes. Any other comments? Okay. Then if there are no others, I would like to thank all of you. I would like to thank all of you. Please continue to tell us how to fix this and to tell ATRT how to move on, how to develop it. And thanks a lot until the next time we talk about all of this. And the next meeting will be on the global public interest issues that were brought up.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]