ICANN73 | Prep Week – ICANN Reviews and Implementation Status Update
Thursday, February 24, 2022 – 11:00 to 12:30 AST

PAMELA SMITH:	Hello, and welcome to the ICANN Reviews and Implementation update. My name is Pamela Smith, and Yvette Guigneaux and I are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the chat pod. I will read the aloud during the time set by the chair of this session, which will be at the end of the presentation during Q&A. Please review the notes for how to frame a question properly. I have posted and will be posting them in the chat pod for the first few minutes. All participants in this session may make comments in the chat.

And with that, I will hand the floor over to Larisa Gurnick. Larisa? |
| LARISA GURNICK: | Thank you, Pamela. Hello, everybody. My name is Larisa Gurnick and I am delighted to welcome you to our ICANN Reviews and Implementation update. I'd also like to introduce Giovanni Seppia. He joined the Implementation Operation Team as Vice-President earlier in 2022. And Giovanni will be one of the presenters today. |

As you know, we have been providing this update on reviews and implementation for a long time. Our objective is to increase community awareness about reviews, why they're important, how they work, and what some of the overarching themes are at this time.

For those that may not be familiar with how we use the term "reviews," they're essentially assessments or evaluations of how well we're doing in various areas. Recognizing the complexity of reviews, our teams have taken up work to make the information simpler and easier to find. There's a great deal of information pertaining to reviews for us to share with you today. We know that some of you are new to ICANN or to the area of reviews. Our goal is to shine a bit of light on why this area is so important.

Others are far more experienced, having observed, participated, and even shared some of the reviews. Well, you know and understand far more about this far body of work. We respect your time and the experience. We'd like this session to be informative and thought-provoking so together we can tackle the challenges and improve how reviews function. We will point you to places where you can find a lot of information and use our time together for an exchange of ideas and discussion.

And with this, I would like to introduce Giovanni. Please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Larisa. Indeed, thanks for the introduction. I just joined ICANN less than two months ago, and I'm happy to join this webinar.

As you just pointed out, the current cycle of reviews is drawing to a close. And therefore, at present, we are focusing on implementing recommendations and also on applying the lesson learned to improve the next cycle of reviews. That is why, before the next cycle of reviews begin, we plan to investigate how to achieve more impactful review outcomes with your help. That includes developing clearer recommendations that can be implemented in a timely manner. Specific review teams in the past issued 125 recommendations, and that was in the last review cycle. We should look at all these recommendations in a comprehensive way. And this webinar will give you to the opportunity to learn about the progress we are making in implementation the various recommendations.

As you may also recall, the community asked ICANN Org to develop a process for prioritizing the implementation work. This will allow ICANN to execute the work of implementation in an efficient manner, taking into account interdependencies and the resources available to the community and to the organization.

Next slide, please. Today's webinar is structured in five sections, and this slide deck will end with a slide about useful resources for you to know more and have a more in-depth overview of what will touch base on during the webinar. We will start with an introduction covering how reviews and implementation of recommendations are managed at ICANN, moving on to explain the importance of reviews within the ICANN ecosystem. We'll then hear about where we stand with the implementation of the various recommendations and projects, with a look at the future, before opening the floor for questions.

ICANN PREP WEEK 73

On to you, Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Giovanni. Next slide, please. It's my pleasure to introduce you to you our team—one more slide, please. It's my pleasure to introduce you to our teams and especially to our new team members: Giovanni, Jason, and Evin. Welcome.

We're two teams, but we operate together to provide end-to-end support to reviews and implementation of community recommendations. So the two teams are Review Support and Accountability, and Implementation Operations. The Review Support and Accountability Team is under the Global Domains and Strategy Function, which is led by Theresa Swinehart. I work with Sherwood, Evin, Jason, Pamela, and Yvette. The Implementation Operation Team is under the Office of the CFO, with is led by Xavier Calvez. Heading up the Implementation Operations Team is Giovanni, and he works with Alice and Negar. And together we support and facilitate the work of reviews and implementation of community recommendations end-to-end.

Back to you, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Larisa. Next slide, please. So this slide illustrates some of the important themes that we'll touch base on during today's webinar, starting from making sure that whatever information we post about reviews and the implementation of recommendations is user-friendly

ICANN PREP WEEK 73

and as accessible as possible. We will also touch base on the prioritization and [resourcing of] topics, including addressing some of the community concerns we are aware of about how long the community recommendations take to implement. There is also the theme of clarity of recommendations, which I will touch base on. Clarity of recommendations is an important factor to inform timely and efficient implementation of those recommendations. And there's going to be also a look at the future when it comes to streamlining processes and procedures for future review cycles.

Thank you. Next slide, and on to you, Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: And now a bit of information about reviews. Next slide, please. Reviews are a type of evaluation to assess how well certain aspects of the ICANN ecosystem are performing. These evaluations also look at how well ICANN Org and the Board fulfill our various commitments. We look at our past performance, including processes, actions, and outcomes, to draw lessons learned and insights—next slide, please—to apply toward improving the future. This fosters innovation and evolution of our multi-stakeholder model. It also helps us deepen our commitment to accountability.

Next slide, please. Reviews are a means of driving for continuous improvement. Reviews function based on a collaborative effort between the ICANN community, Board, and Org. We do this in a variety of ways by applying best practices, innovative ideas, and, most importantly, in alignment with ICANN's vision, mission, and strategic

plan. Continuous improvement is important because it helps us stay relevant and prepares us to meet emerging challenges and opportunities.

Next slide, please. The process of reviews also enhances our accountability and transparency, which are important to maintaining the health of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. It is an opportunity for community volunteers to make their voices heard, whether by serving on a review team or providing input to public comment proceedings or even less formal interactions, such as today's webinar. Reviews are about checks and balances, staying true to our mandate and commitments.

Next slide, please. There are two types of reviews: specific reviews and organizational reviews. Specific reviews focus on several specific key areas of ICANN's work with the global stakeholder community and reflect an effort to continuously improve.

The four areas that are covered by specific reviews are: competition, consumer trust, & consumer choice, registration directory services, accountability & transparency, and security, stability & resiliency of the domain name system. Those are four specific reviews. And, as I am sure many of you know, they have acronyms, which we will get into in a moment.

Specific reviews are conducted to community volunteers. As you can see from this process chart, they're cyclical and they're also circular. That is, they take place on a predefined schedule approximately every five years. The outcomes from one review serve as inputs into the next

review cycle. The goal is to assess what is working and what can be improved so that areas that need improvement can be addressed and result in tangible benefit to the ICANN community. This happens through review recommendations which are issued by each review team.

Final review recommendations go to the ICANN Board, and the Board determines what to do with each recommendation: approve, reject, or ask for more information by placing recommendations into a pending status. Next, the Board-approved recommendations are prioritized. You will hear more about the work underway in this area. The point of this step is to determine what should be tackled ahead of something else.

The order of implementation. From here, prioritized recommendations go through implementation design, where ICANN Org determines sequential steps and resources needed in order to implement. Implementation design feeds into ICANN's annual operating planning and budget cycle, where funds and resources are allocated to specific project and work. This leads to implementation, which ideally is completed well before the next review cycle begins.

In reality, the life cycle of reviews has highlighted various challenges and also opportunities for improvement—for example, multiple reviews happening at the same time, reviews taking a long time to complete, large number of community recommendations, and long implementation cycles. Improvement efforts are underway, and we will discuss that later in this presentation, including recommendations

ICANN PREP WEEK 73

from one of our specific reviews—the ARTR3—which tackles the process of reviews.

My colleagues will provide links to additional information, if they haven't done so already, on the ICANN review process, and that will be posted in the chat. And there you can see process for specific reviews and organizational reviews as they're currently conducted.

And now let's move on to organizational reviews. Next slide, please. Organizational reviews focus on assessing the effectiveness of supporting organizations and advisory committees in meeting the needs of the global stakeholder community.

Organizational reviews are conducted by an independent examiner rather than community volunteers. This is one of the key differences from the way specific reviews work. The independent examiners assess whether each organization has a continuing purpose, whether any change in structure or operations is needed to improve its effectiveness, and whether the organization is [accountable to] constituencies and stakeholders.

The reviews of different organizations are currently in various phases, with most moving towards completion of the second round of reviews. This is an important milestone that demonstrates accountability. Independent reviews lead to recommendations that are implemented in order to improve how the organizations function and serve their stakeholders. As you can see here, implementation work has been completed by the GNSO, the ALAC, SSAC, and the ccNSO. And

implementation is in progress, nearing completion, by the team for the RSSAC Review and the NomCom Review.

In the spirit of continuous improvement, we note lessons learned from each review and, together with community input, we'll use these learnings to inform the next cycle and improve outcomes. You will hear more about how continuous improvement will impact organizational reviews as part of the implementation update on ATRT3 recommendations. The Board approved ATRT3 recommendations, and they will have an impact on how organizational reviews will work in the future. One of the ATRT3 recommendations to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. Timing of the next cycle of organizational reviews will be affected by the implementation of ATRT3 recommendations.

And you will note that, as part of the Board action and implementation, the Board had deferred the next GNSO review in June of 2021 to allow for the implementation work to progress. And work is underway to more comprehensively address the next organizational review cycle in consultation with the ICANN community as other reviews besides the GNSO will be coming due in short order.

And now Negar will provide an update on the implementation work. So, Negar, please

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you very much, Larisa. Hello, everyone. My name is Nega Farzinnia. I'm a member of the Implementation Operations Team at

ICANN Org and will be providing you with an update on the status of some of the reviews today.

Next slide, please. Thank you. Before we delve into the status of reviews and their implementation, I wanted to show you a quick overview of the specific reviews and the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on Work Stream 2.

As you can see from this chart, the reviews, more or less, were conducted in parallel under the current bylaws' mandated timing associated with these specific reviews. And with Board action having completed on all of these reviews and Work Stream 2, these projects are all in various stages of implementation.

Now, to better understand and showcase this point, let's proceed to the next slide, please. Thank you. If you recall, from the wheel chart, the process of reviews that the Larisa just spoke to a couple of slides ago, each of our projects, whether they're reviews or the work of some cross-community working groups, go through a similar cycle of predictable steps, from inception to full implementation. For each of these projects, we have highlighted their respective various steps that have either been completed or are in progress to show you the study work that's taking place across a plethora of projects here.

The light green steps are highlighting stages of work that are currently in progress. What's highlighted in dark green are steps that have already been completed. So while each of these projects are in various stages of completion, work is taking place across all of them, whether

it is in the form of implementation design, preparing for prioritization, and/or implementation.

Of the projects you see listed here (the four specific reviews[,] CCT, RDS, ATRT3, SSR2, and work on Work Stream 2, and the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model project) [they] are currently in the Implementation Operations Team's purview to be worked on for implementation and next steps. The auction proceeds is still in the Board action phase. So once that stage is completed, that project would move under Implementation Operations for initiation of the work of implementation.

Now, as you may be aware, some of these projects include recommendations which were placed into pending status by the Board for various reasons, such as the Board needing more information or clarification on a given recommendation, in order to make an informed decision on said recommendations. For these pending recommendations, the Board has clearly stated the actions that ICANN Org must undertake and complete before these recommendations can move out of pending status.

So that is work that ICANN Org is handling in parallel to working on Board-approved recommendations to make sure that even the ones that are pending status can be worked on and moved to the next stage and go in front of the Board again for action. Later on, we will discuss examples of this work.

Next slide, please. Thank you. In this chart, you will see the breakdown of the Board action on various review recommendations. Note that this

breakdown applies to the four specific reviews only. Of the overall recommendations that have resulted from these four specific reviews, the majority of them, totaling up to 50 recommendations, have been accepted by the Board. In total, there are currently 44 recommendations that are in pending status. In the following slides, we will go into more details on the status of these recommendations and the work that's getting done to move them towards Board action.

There were 16 recommendation that were passed through to various parts of the community. For example, in the case of the CCT review, the recommendations were assigned by the review team to various community groups in the final report and, as such, the Board passed them through the relevant groups and constituencies for their consideration.

And last but not least, we have a total of 18 recommendations that were rejected across some of these reviews. The Board's rationale for rejection of each of these recommendations is detailed out in the relevant work resolution and accompanying documents.

Next slide, please. Thank you. So as you can see from this chart, of the total 15 Board-approved recommendations, 17 recommendations are from the CCT Review. 15 are from the RDS. Five, including the 15 component parts, [are] from the ATRT3 Review. And 13 recommendations are from the SSR2 Review, which was most recently approved out of all of the reviews you see listed here.

So let's take a little deeper look into the status of these Board-approved recommendations and where they stand. Next slide, please. Of the

overall 50 Board-approved recommendations, 14 of them are recommendations whose implementation has been completed. Some of these recommendations are from the CCT Review, RDS, and SSR2. Note that, as is the normal practice for ICANN Org, we will be producing detailed documentation on how each of these recommendations were implemented. Now, in accordance with the ICANN bylaws, the future review teams will be assessing the implementation of relevant recommendations and the extent to which the implementation is deemed complete.

So what's happening with the rest of the Board-approved recommendations? That's a good question. About 60% of the recommendations are currently pending prioritization. If you've been following this work, you will recall that, during FY21, ICANN Org launched the planning prioritization framework project with the intent to run a pilot focusing on the prioritization of the recommendations resulting from specific reviews. Please note that there's a separate section organized by ICANN Org's planning team, actually right after this session today at 17:00 UTC, to provide with you an update on the planning and prioritization process. And I highly encourage you to attend that session for more information on the next steps in the prioritization process.

Next slide, please. Thank you. So let's take a deeper look at the status of the pending recommendations. As I noted earlier, there are a total of 44 recommendations across various reviews that are currently in pending status. Of these 44 recommendations, six recommendations are from the CCT Review, two of which have dependencies on ongoing

community work and discussions on DNS abuse. ICANN Org is continuing to work on the remaining four recommendations that are in pending status to address the actions that the Board noted in its scorecard accompanying the Board resolution in order to move it forward towards Board action.

In total, the RDS Review has four recommendations that are pending, and they're pending the completion of the work on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 topics. So once that work is completed, we can move these full recommendations towards Board action, depending on the outcome of the work on EPDP. And the remaining 34 recommendations that are pending are from the SSR2 Review.

ICANN Org has been actively working on addressing the Board's request on these recommendations to move them forward. Most of these recommendations require clarification before the Board can take action on these recommendations.

To date, we've communicated two different sets of clarifying questions on a number of these pending recommendations to the SSR2 implementation shepherds. And for those of you who may not be familiar with the rule of the implementation shepherds, they are members of the review team who kindly have agreed to continue to engage with ICANN Org whenever we need to seek clarification to better understand the language or the intent of a given review's recommendations.

We communicated the first set of clarifying questions to the SSR2 implementation shepherds in early December, 2021, and the shepherds

provided their responses to those questions in January of this year. Just a few days ago, on February 17th, we communicated the second set of clarifying questions on another subset of SSR2 pending recommendations to the shepherds and are looking forward to getting their responses. The outcome of these engagements with the engagement shepherds and the responses that they're providing are being taken into account by ICANN Org in the analysis we're doing to prepare the Board to take further action on these pending recommendations.

With that, let me hand it over to my colleague, Alice Jansen, to provide you with an update on the status of the Work Stream 2 implementation.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you very much, Negar. Hi, everyone. My name is Alice Jansen. I'm a member of the Implementation Operations Department.

Work Stream 2 of the Enhancing ICANN Accountability process is one of the two implementation projects which originate from a cross-community effort. You will hear Negar speak about the second one in a moment.

For those who are not familiar with Work Stream 2, it encompasses over 100 Board-approved recommendations intended for the community, for the Board, and for the Org to implement. It covers a range of topics, such as improving diversity, improving the office of the ombuds, improving transparency, improving staff accountability, and so on.

ICANN PREP WEEK 73

So we're happy to report here that implementation design for Work Stream 2 has concluded. And implementation is ongoing. The team of cross-functional subject matter experts is working towards [implementation] milestones and is continually refining the deliverables as work progresses on this priority in our fiscal year '22.

As illustrated here in the charts, with respect to Org implementation, we currently have ten recommendations for which implementation is complete. Implementation is also underway for 38 implementations, and we're about to kick off another three. Currently, we have two recommendations that are tied to dependency on the subsequent procedures of the new gTLDs. There's also a set of twelve recommendations which require the completion of another before we can launch the implementation. We call them the cascading recommendations. The Org is working on unlocking these dependencies where possible.

The implementation design phase also included how to best support the community groups in their Work Stream 2 implementation efforts. And the community groups are making great progress in addressing the implementation of the relevant recommendations—the SO and AC accountability [section] being one of the largest portions of that.

One important update here is that the SO and AC chairs have agreed to form a lightweight Work Stream 2 community coordination group. This group will serve as a forum for exchanging best practices and information as community groups progress through their implementation work. Additionally, it will be an avenue for discussing

and coordinating on recommendations that warrant a uniform community-wide approach. The current tentative timeline for this group to convene for its first meeting is after ICANN73, and ICANN Org will support its activities.

We expect much progress to happen on Work Stream 2 implementation in the coming months. To give you an example, ICANN Org recently released a request proposal for diversity, equity, and inclusion consulting services. This is an important undertaking, as it will move the diversity recommendations forward and we will [inaudible] and dependencies by doing so.

We look forward to sharing additional updates on the status of Work Stream 2 implementation and are happy to note and announce here that an implementation summary will be released in this first quarter of the year 2022. In the meantime, there's a dedicated work page where you can find status updates for each recommendation. I will drop the link in the chat in a moment for you.

With that, let me hand it over back to Negar, who will share an implementation update on enhancing the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNI: Thank you, Alice. Could we go to the next slide, please? Thank you very much. Enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder program, as you may recall, originated in 2019 with the objective to focus on evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model of governance. This

community-wide effort identified six overarching issues which are hindering the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model today. And further community discussions prioritized three of these six issues for a more immediate-term implementation.

To better determine how each of these issues could be addressed, further discussions with the community took place, which identified a number of activities and projects which are currently underway within the community, ICANN Org, and/or the Board that could address these issues. The discussions with the community also identified some gap areas that need to be addressed to cohesively alleviate the issues that have been identified.

A number of the projects that are underway have already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. And ICANN Org is evaluating the gaps that have been identified and the new projects that the ICANN community, Org, and Board have undertaken that could help the effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model and addressing these issues.

In the course of the discussions between the Board, the Org, and the community, everyone also agreed that it would be really beneficial to be able to evaluate some of these projects and work tracks that we are undertaking in order to assess how they impact the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model.

And so, to that end, ICANN Org undertook designing a proposed evaluation methodology to help the Org, Board and the community evaluate how the multi-stakeholder model has evolved. This work has

now been completed. And so, currently, ICANN Org is developing an action plan to introduce the proposed evaluation methodology to the community and engage with various constituencies on the application and use of this methodology on our projects and work tracks. So please stay tuned for more information on this and how we will continue to carry this important initiative forward.

With that, I'll pass the presentation over to my colleague Giovanni to walk us through the future of the work of the reviews.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Negar. Next slide, please. So I'm going to cover the first three points, and I'm happy to see that there's quite some heat on the discussion floor. So I look forward to opening the discussion/the Q&A section of this webinar.

So the first three points, starting with the simpler and more information, as some of you may know me, I'm what somebody has defined as an industry veteran. I must say that "veteran" in Italy has a negative connotation, but it's okay. I can live with that. So as an industry veteran, I thought I was somehow facilitat[ing] in entering the review and implementation of recommendations [in] ICANN. And I was at some point facilita[ting] [them] because I participated in ICANN since nearly its start.

However, what I did not realize was that there is such an amount of work behind the review process and the implementation-of-recommendations process. And this is something I believe a large part

of the community should see, and that's why we started to revamp our pages about reviews and implementation of recommendations as well, as well as revamping the community of ICANN.org's wiki pages about the accountability and the reviews and implementation of recommendations.

So the purpose of this exercise is to indeed, as somebody is currently asking and pointing to in the chat, show the progress that we are making against implementing the different sets of recommendations, as well as having the language of recommendations more accessible to most of the community because you really need to commit yourself to, let's say, read through the different reviews and the different implementation frameworks. So this is really quite important. This is the work that we are currently doing with the objective of having those pages—at least the community pages—revamped in the short term.

The second point I'm going to touch base on is the prioritization and resourcing. We understand, as we can see now in the chat, that there are several community concerns about the time for implementing certain recommendations. I must say that ICANN is working hard to implement recommendations as fast as possible.

Recently, as some of you may know, planning at ICANN is one of the 15 operating initiatives that are included in the fiscal year '21 and fiscal year '22 operating plans. A key deliverable of this initiative is to design and implement a so-called prioritization framework to announce the effectiveness of the unknown annual planning process by prioritizing activities in the mid and the long term.

ICANN is about to launch a prioritization pilot exercise for recommendations and for Board-approved recommendations. And this pilot exercise will serve ICANN to implement recommendations in a more efficient and timely manner. This is also something that the community asked ICANN to look into. And there's going to be a webinar after this webinar from the planning department that is going to dive more into the prioritization exercise and the prioritization framework.

The last part of the last point I'm going to cover is the clarity of the recommendation. This is something that, again, is coming from the industry, coming from the community. I have had the chance in the past to read some of the recommendations. I was also part of the CCWG working group, including the working group on accountability.

So I must say I am somewhat guilty for certain recommendations because, looking back at those recommendations and reading them, again, sometimes personally I don't find them so clear. And this applies not only to certain specific recommendations. But overall, we should all work together to make recommendations as clear as possible because, once we have clarity, usually things flow into place faster. And this is something important to take into account. It's a big lesson we have learned for future review cycles. So it's a to-do at both sides that we should have ahead of us.

And, that said, I'm going to leave the floor to Larisa for covering the last two points of this slide. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Giovanni. And building on the points that Giovanni has made, as well as robust discussion in the chat, there is clear agreement and understanding about the need for change, as Jeff and others have pointed out.

So in terms of streamlining process and procedures and looking at how to address some of these backlogs and concerns and issues in the future, we have kicked off a project within ICANN Org—Life Cycle of Reviews—to look at some of our internal processes and ways that we support the review cycle end-to-end to fine-tune the process and change the process where it would be appropriate and work very closely with the community to fix the known problems that have been identified.

The Life Cycle of Reviews' project in the very immediate term will focus on the kinds of things that Giovanni was talking about, specifically making the recommendation status and updates and information more easily accessible, easier to find, and easier to understand, both in terms of summaries at a high-level as well as details for those that are interested in finding out more information.

We're also looking at all the different work happening within the ICANN ecosystem that touches on reviews and the process of fixing reviews, such as ATRT3 recommendations, evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, and various other components to understand how all this work can come together swiftly to make improvements to the next cycle of reviews.

Which brings us to the final point that I wanted to cover. In order to gain control of prioritizing the existing backlog of recommendations, getting those implemented, and making improvements to the next cycle, there will be a couple of activities that will be deferred until such time that it makes sense to resume some of these reviews. For example, the deferral [of] the upcoming Board action to consider the timing of the next SSR Review (Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review). At its March Board meeting, there will be a discussion and an expected action for the Board to consider that timing[.]

Based on the current bylaws and the timeline that's provided there[,] SSR3 would be starting in March 2022 for the various reasons that ATRT3 outlined in their recommendation and community recommendations to defer that review until the next accountability and transparency reviews and also to make sure that there is sufficient time to conclude the work on implementing recommendations from the current cycle of SSR2. The Board is looking at that possibility. Similar work has happened in organizational reviews [in that]. As I already mentioned, the next review of the GNSO was already deferred in June of 2021, and similar actions are underway with engagement of the different community groups to find their views on the timing for the next review cycle and see if it makes sense to defer those reviews until such time that new processes and improvements to how this could all work are in place.

So with that—next slide, please—I think we are at the end of our prepared remarks. And I know that there is lots of questions and lots of interesting discussions.

So just to quickly summarize what hopefully you were able to take away from this presentation, there are lots of recommendations that need to be implemented. Work is underway to prioritize but [it's also] an opportunity through the prioritization process to look at old recommendations that may or not be relevant and consider whether some recommendations need to be retired and also to come up with a sequence of recommendations for implementation so that, with focused attention, things can get done more swiftly.

And, importantly, we're beginning work on process improvements and continuous improvement of the review process itself, which will also consume important time and effort but will be critical to ensure that the next round of reviews and how reviews are conducted can produce perhaps fewer, more focused recommendations that are clear with a clear path toward implementation and, importantly, a solid understanding between the review teams, the broader community, the Board, and Org as to how that could be implemented in short order so that, once we work through the backlog and inventory of these recommendations and implement process improvements, we can look forward to a more productive outcome of the review process with the help of all of you.

And with that, I will pass this on to Pamela, who will moderate the Q&A. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Larisa. I appreciate that. So we will begin the Q&A section of the presentation at this point. I'll be reading the questions we have

captured from the chat, and the proper subject-matter expert appropriate to the topic will answer.

Okay, so let me get back to the top of my document. The first question was from Jeffrey Neuman. "Because there are so many formal steps in between the delivery of the final recommendations and the implementation, it takes years to get to the implementation. The question is how to reduce the time of those formal steps. If implementation depends on A) Board approval, B) then prioritization, C) then being put into an annual plan and then D) planning for implementation, and then starting to implement, then we will never implement effective improvements in a timely manner." Who will address that, please?

THERESA SWINEHART: I think Xavier's hand is up.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yeah. Can I go on, Pamela?

PAMELA SMITH: Please.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. And thank you, Jeff. And Jeff is pointing to an important topic, which is I think everyone is concerned … I think we all appreciate—and when I say "we," I don't mean "we Org"; I mean all of

ICANN PREP WEEK 73

us together as an ecosystem—that there's a lot of things to do, and not just implementation work, obviously. And as a community and as an ecosystem, being able to carry out all that work is demanding, generally speaking and requires a lot of time and bandwidth for all of us and obviously of Org, obviously of the Board, and obviously of the community. And in that implementation work, there's a lot of community involvement as well, which is the right, obviously, thing to do.

And to just point out, the process to be able to go from a recommendation to a completed set of activities that are embedded into overall activities is a process that takes time. And as Jeff indicated, there is the need for prioritization as well as planning. Otherwise, it's also impossible to provide an action plan. If anyone can think that an action plan can be produced without designing what needs to be done, without planning for it, that's called chaos. And that's not something that anyone can look forward for for efficiency and competition.

So I think, to Jeff's point, we need to be able to look at those steps and see how we make them more effective or easier to carry out, while always ensuring that our entire ecosystem is adequately involved in a manner that suits each topic and each process. And of course that's something we're all continuously learning to do. We learn to work together better as we go. Take, for example, the ODP process. The Operational Design Phase process is a step that helps provide transparency to decision-making, for example.

So that's the type of things that we're all learning to work together on. There's the prioritization processes that are currently being designed and developed, and the community is about to participate in a prioritization pilot so that we are learning together to go through the planning steps that lead us to be able to implement faster. But implementing without planning is absolutely going to result in chaos, which is obviously an irresponsible approach to trying to do the best we all can together for ICANN's mission. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Xavier.

Let's see. Hang on. Let me get to the next one. I have a lovely long list, so thank you so much. Jeff's subsequent question on how quickly, in theory, a recommendation can be implemented Xavier has addressed.

Then our next question is from Anne Aikman-Scalese. "Auction proceeds was delivered in 2020, I think. Isn't there a lot of money sitting in auction proceeds that is not going to any good use as was promised in connection with the 2012 round that resulted in those funds existing? And isn't a fact that now reconciliation of differing opinions in the community is required? Why is the Board action on auction proceeds delayed?" And I have a note that Xavier will address this also.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Pamela. I have addressed it in the chat, actually, earlier. So I think that this question is addressed. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. All right. From Martin Sutton: "It does sound like progress has been made but is not clearly visible in the data or charts shared. Is there a comparison to status position of March 2021?"

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'll take that on as well to just not linger. There's no specific comparison compared to [inaudible], Martin. And I fully agree that being able to show progress in addition to status is something that we want to try to do a bit more on than we have in the past. An illustration of that is, for example, the blog that we published on WS2. As progress was being made during December, for example, we indicated progress or implementation competition of a few recommendations to actually demonstrate progress as it was happening.

And I think the ability to compare [pair-to-pair], to your point, is something that will be helpful for us to be able to do as we continue reporting periodically and consistently on the status of implementation of work. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: All righty. Let me scroll back up. And an additional question from Martin. "It does sound like progress. [Is it] not clearly visible? Is there a comparison to a status position as of March 2021?" And I think you addressed that.

Let me scroll on down. From Robert Gaetano: "Although reviews have never been very fast, I am under the impression that the situation is getting worse. Have we identified at least some of the reason for the increase in the timeline?" Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry, Pamela. This is an old hand.

PAMELA SMITH: Oh. My apologies.

THERESA SWINEHART: I can help with that one.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.

THERESA SWINEHART: Hi, Roberto. It's great to see the question. I think, from what you've seen from also various presentations, there has been a confluence of multiple reviews that have recommendations that have been coming in around the same timeframe. And I think one of the areas of looking at how to improve reviews is also looking at the points that Xavier had made with regards to the different aspects of improving reviews. But there are quite a few review recommendations. We'd had some earlier charts that showed how many were around the same timeline and how

many review recommendations were coming in, some of them that have dependencies on each other.

So it's moving as quickly as possible, but there's a lot of different things going on. So I hope that helps with that answer. And more than happy to add. I'll provide some links to some of the former graphics around that.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Theresa. Question from Susan Payne: "Do the bylaws need to be changed regarding timing? If SSR2 overran as it did, then it makes no sense to begin the SSR3 already. Should we be marking the time for the next review from the delivery of the review team report and not from the commencement of the previous review? I appreciate that ATRT3 made recommendations about changing the review structure, but this is, in itself, pending. Should we not make some practical changes to the bylaws now rather than have the Board deferring reviews on an ad hoc basis when there is clearly an issue with the bylaws' mandated timing?" Larisa, will you address that?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Pamela. Yes. Thank you for that question, Susan. Bylaw changes will be needed, indeed, as you note. And the ATRT3 recommendations contemplate those bylaws changes. While the timing of delivery of the report could be a good marker to start the clock, we don't have community direction from ATRT3 or otherwise that we should institute this change to [inaudible] just yet.

So instead of approaching this through piecemeal bylaws changes, ICANN Org is committed to implementing the ATRT3 recommendations, and then we will have a full, more comprehensive set of bylaws changes at that time. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: From Frederick Felman: "Should there be participation by implementation team members in the review recommendation authoring process to expedite the creation of more actionable recommendations?" Xavier, would you please take that?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. "Yes" is the answer to the question. That's absolutely what we expect to do [as] the [annual] review will occur. This is to the point that you're making[.] We think a very helpful support to the review teams to have an insight on the implementability of recommendations so that the recommendations are shaped in a manner that will also facilitate and [inaudible] so absolutely our intention as well. And I think this is one of the many types of improvements to the review process that we are all going to [inaudible].

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. All right. I am reviewing the chat and I'm not seeing any further questions at the—oh. A new one came in. From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Xavier: "Why are you declining to address the auction proceeds question in a live format? Not everyone monitors the chat, and

especially if there are vision issues among participants, we do not want to disadvantage those who do not see well."

XAVIER CALVEZ: Anne, I answered the question in the format it was asked. So I'm happy to speak to it more, but maybe you can help with flagging or focusing my answer with the more interesting or important aspect of your questions. I'm not sure exactly what part you would like answered differently. Would that be possible?

I think Anne's hand is up, so hopefully she can speak up.

PAMELA SMITH: Just one moment. Xavier, it's coming up that apparently the answer is not … I will scroll through the chat and see if I can find your response, but some seemed not to be able to find it. If you could readdress that because the participants are muted. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes. Thank you. So I think, Anne, I'm going to quote or paraphrase, but Anne's point is that the auction proceeds are [an] amount of money. And for those who do not know, there is a little bit more than $200 million of auction proceeds that have been collected from the New gTLD Program in the years between 2014 and 2016. And that is intended for grant-making, generally speaking, for the benefit of the Internet.

I think Anne's point is also because this will be useful funds for "doing good" as a simple term. It is important to be able to work on distributing those funds for those good benefits.

So for those who may not know, there was a cross-community working group that developed recommendations that worked between the end of 2016 and 2020—so about four-and-a-half-years—for the Board to consider. And those recommendations are basically offering the option to the Board to choose between two different mechanisms of structure to distribute these auction proceeds, these funds. And those recommendations were submitted to the Board towards the end of December, 2020. So these recommendations are for the Board to consider.

There's currently work being done at the request of the Board by the organization to propose to the Board a path for the decision that the Board needs to be making on the recommendations that have been submitted by the CCWG (Cross-Community Working Group), and the Board will consider that suggested path. It may be that the Board determines that an operational design phase is necessary to address the complexity of the topic about the grant-making program to be designed. But whether or not that is the case, the Board is going to consider their recommendations based on the [parliamentary] analysis that the Org will provide to the Board in the next few weeks.

So I think that's the status at the moment. And some asked—not right now—in the past that or have made the point that these proceeds are sitting idle and ICANN is benefitting from these funds through the

interest that they generate. And ICANN Org is not using any amount of money from the auction proceeds. Never touches those funds. Any interest to that is earned by those auction proceeds. It goes back to those auction proceeds is completely untouched. There has not been a dollar that has been used of those auction proceeds for any purpose so far. I just wanted to be clear for everyone.

I hope that helps but, Anne, if it doesn't or if there's an aspect of your question that I have not addressed, please flag it in the chat and I will try to address it. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: From Jeffrey Neuman: "These provide status of recommendations, but there is no establishment of timelines to completion. There are no milestones to complete. In short, we're not complying with Work Stream 2. Would you please address?" And that would be either Xavier or Giovanni, I believe.

Giovanni, if you will. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Pamela, and thank you, Jeff, for all the questions. I've read very well that the timeline is one of the most asked questions. And I will make sure, as I said, that we are updating the reports and the web pages about the reviews and the implementation of recommendations. I'll make sure that I address this point internally. And I'll make sure that, in the near future—and the near future for me means yesterday, but I cannot commit to yesterday; I can commit to the coming weeks, but

certainly by the end of March—there's going to be updated pages on the community .ICANN.org about the different specific reviews and the WS2 and will make sure that we insert timelines as much as possible after we have discussed this internally.

So, as I said, for those who know me, when I commit to something, it's committed. And I will follow up. You have my e-mail address. E-mail addressed at ICANN are quite e-mail. So it's giovanni.seppia@ICANN.org. You can e-mail me at any time, and I will provide you updates, as I will provide an update to all the community about the work we are doing. As I said, I believe that there is the need also to communicate more about what ICANN is doing behind its revie process and each recommendation. My first meeting at ICANN was in 2001, so it's 21 years at ICANN. I was not aware of how much work is behind. And therefore I'll make sure that this is now more visible as well as timelines become part of, let's say, the process that we share with you as much as possible. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, Giovanni.

Larisa, go ahead. You have your hand raised. At that point—hold on one moment. We're checking on the ability to speak. Hold on.

Larisa, go ahead. You have your hand raised.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much, Pamela. Noting the various comments and points in the chat about the technical setup of the room with participants being unmuted at certain points, I just wanted to acknowledge we see all those comments and it was not intentional to have folks being muted. So we're checking into the technical settings for this room and taking all your comments on board to make sure that the people can interact and speak during the discussion Q&A. So it was not the intention that people wouldn't be able to speak, and we'll take that on board for planning for the next webinar. So thank you very much for highlighting that.

PAMELA SMITH: Actually, Wolf, tech support can unmute you. Alex, would you please unmute Wolf so he can ask his question?

MTS TECH-ALEX: I just gave him the ability to unmute themselves. So they still have to unmute themselves.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. Wolf, please go ahead and unmute and ask your question.

Wolf, I still can't hear you and I cannot unmute you. I need you to unmute yourself.

While you're waiting on that, I'll move on to the next question. Sebastien, can you please unmute and ask your question?

Oh, Wolf, there you go.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. I will speak in French. If I hear exactly what I am [seeing] in French, that's not quite right. In any case, I simply wanted to say that, in the ATRT3 proposal, there are many items. In particular, there is a proposal for all of the reviews. And they were set aside with some sort of a disdain from the Board—from ICANN Org as well, but ICANN Org couldn't necessarily do much about it. But I think it is urgent to implement the ATRT3 recommendations so that we don't waste time, whether it is on the organizational reviews or on the holistic reviews. It is truly an emergency, and I think that the planning question is important. That is true. However, in certain reviews, it was addressed.

The second thing I wanted to say—I will stop after that—is that we need to explain to everyone that ATRT3 is the only review that took into account the new way of doing reviews. That's why there are only five proposals as compared to the others. And so it's really hard to compare if you just put everything in the same basket. Thank you very much.

Yes, there is disdain, Ms. Doria. You're saying that there is not, but there is.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. From Marita Moll, we have a question: "Would it be possible to get a graphic showing where the MSM intersects with the other reviews, as it is not stated alone as an item?" Xavier, thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you [inaudible]. So I think Marita's point is very important. It's that the effectiveness of the MSM is more program than project. And among this program, there is the monitoring of a number of different projects that are carried out separately from it and that contribute to improving some of the issues.

So take, for example, the PDP 3.0. It is work to design to redesign the PDP process that has been carried out. And that improves or is expected to improve the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. So this is not a project that is created by the program of effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model, but that's a project that already existed. But that does contribute to the effectiveness. And this effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model is one program that is intending to monitor the benefits of various activities and actions that are carried out to that effectiveness, as well as complementing those existing or already-in-process projects with more specific actions to address any gaps that there is between what is already being done and the issues that are designed to be addressed.

Among those, to Marita's point, there is the reviews and how the reviews are going to be evolving, largely thanks to the recommendations of ATRT3 but also with other potential process improvements that can be designed and incorporated into the process of reviews that would help the overall effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model.

Marita, in the latest publication on the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model, there was a diagram that was intending to try to map the various existing projects to the issues that had been identified during the evaluation with the community on the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. And I would therefore refer you to that diagram that I think starts addressing your question, even though I don't believe there was detail of each of the reviews and how these effect the overall effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. But I think ATRT3 was mentioned and specified, and we'll try to make [sure that] the link to that document is copied in the chat. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Very good. And, now, Alex, if you would unmute Jeffrey Neuman. Jeffrey, it is your turn to take the floor.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Hopefully you can hear me. And thank you for accommodating the voice presentation because it's a lot easier. And certainly things can look a lot more critical on text or in writing than it does when you can actually speak.

So I just first want to say that I know I have a lot of comments and questions in there, but none of it is meant with any kind of animosity or anything like that. I know that the team is working very hard, and I know that the team has been enhanced with more people—and good people. So this is not against the work that's been done. So I want to make that point first because I know how words alone may come across.

But I do want to say, just to address what Xavier has put on in the chat, which is about things being dependent upon community, yes, that is true in some areas, but it seems that the community has become the scapegoat for ICANN in a lot of recent letters and in communications. And I don't think that's a good trend with the community being blamed for everything—not that I want to get caught up on blaming, but I just don't like the trend to kind of use the community as the excuse for certain things not getting done when it's not really the community. And so we just need to be careful of how we throw that out.

So on Xavier's point specifically, yes, there are a couple items in here in the charts that say, "Under community review." And things like that can't really have dates from ICANN, obviously, provided in there. But there are lot of things that say, "Implement design pending," or, "Impleemnt design completed pending implementation." Those are generally things that are not community-driven, and those are the things that we love to see dates associated with.

And not to pick on Theresa at all, but just because Theresa used the phrase that we're hearing a lot, which is "as soon as possible," I just want to point out that the Org uses that phrase so much now. And months go by and that phrase just doesn't have any meaning anymore. None of us no, when someone says, "as soon as possible," whether that means today, tomorrow, or next year.

So just a kind request just to perhaps take that phrase out of the vocabulary of ICANN Org and to put realistic dates or things that people can expect with timelines because, like is said, things like "as soon as

possible" or "we're making great progress" just don't mean anything anymore, unfortunately. Thanks.

PAMELA SMITH: Xavier, would you like to go ahead? Go ahead.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I'll address very shortly because we've already discussed a number of things through the chat. First, I'm very happy to hear Jeff not wanting that blame being assigned. I think that everyone will welcome that.

Second, I think that, to Jeff's point, the ability to provide timelines to our collective work is important so that there is predictability so that we can all organize ourselves to work together on what needs to be worked on together.

Jeff, it's not about blaming the community for the slowness of the work. It's making sure that we want to include the community in that work where it is warranted and where it is important. If Org would simply carry on its work completely independently, irrespective of community input, you all, very logically, would have the concerns of not being involved in the work. Org is not working for itself. It works for the benefit of the Internet and for the end users. And in doing that, we need to all work together.

So it's not about blaming each other and looking at each other and blaming the other. It's sitting by each other, working together, and

looking in the same direction, which is the future. And that collaboration and is important. Not mentioning that there's community involvement in the work would be ignoring the community's contribution and necessary involvement in the work of implementation so that the Org continues to be kept accountable to the benefit of the work that has been designed and to its effects.

And so I absolutely am with you. It's not about blame. It's about being able to work, actually, together and looking in the same direction together to accomplish the work that has been set out for us through the various reviews, cross-community work group, but also the policy working groups that have produced draft recommendations. All that work is what we need to plan together. And then we need be able to develop action plans that then lead to timelines.

I just want to reemphasize what Giovanni was saying earlier. Spitting out due dates like this without any grounds for what those due dates are going to be is—

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: [inaudible]

XAVIER CALVEZ: If we can mute Wolf-Ulrich, that would be helpful. Thank you. Producing dates without having an action plan that is leading to those dates is going to completely useless because there's no basis for the date to be what it is. We therefore need to be able to plan for the work and then be

able to commit to deadlines, which is what Giovanni was explaining earlier. Thank you.

PAMELA SMITH:

Okay. With that, I don't see any further questions in the chat pod, and I see no other hands raised. So I'd like to thank all the presenters. And please note that, in our final slide, if we could move forward, we have resource links to all of the review wikis, which will be available in the slide deck.

And we'd also like to bring your attention to other of our prep week sessions which may be of interest to you. We have the planning and prioritization update webinar, which happens today at 17:00 UTC. Then we also have the Nominating Committee Review Implementation Working Group update, which happens at 18:30 UTC. And we'd like to thank you for joining us.

Theresa, did you want to make any wrap-up comments for this session?

THERESA SWINEHART:

Yeah, I would, actually. I first really would like to thank everybody for joining and for participating and the comments and the suggestions. I think, as we've been trying to reflect, we're all in this together. The reviews and the process around reviews is really an important way in the ICANN mechanisms for looking at improvements in a collaborative way.

And I think, from what you've heard from the discussions, we're really at a unique point in ICANN's history in looking forward to how we can evolve and make these reviews as effective and efficient as possible and streamline them and also help address a lot of the issues that have been discussed today. Between the ATRT3 and the prioritization work and the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model and other work that the community is doing, I think we have a good opportunity to work together and make all of this as effective and efficient as possible.

So I just wanted to say a big thanks to everybody. And I appreciate the dialogue. So thank you.

PAMELA SMITH: Thank you, everyone, for joining us. It's just about time for the next webinar. So enjoy ICANN73 Prep Week. We thank you so much for your participation. It's very valuable. And enjoy ICANN73 to follow. Have a great day. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]