At-Large Workspace: Next Steps on Reviews

Public Comment Close	Statement Name	Status	Assignee(s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
05 October 2018	Next Steps On Reviews	**ADOPTED** 13Y, 0N, 0A	Alan Greenberg	02 October 2018	04 October 2018	05 October 2018	09 October 2018	05 October 2018	Larisa Gurnick larisa.gurnick@icann.org	**AL-ALAC-ST-1018-01-01-EN**

Hide the information below, please click here >>

Brief Overview

Purpose: The purpose of this Public Comment is to provide further opportunity for consultation due to the limited number of comments received on the short-term and long-term options to adjust the timeline of reviews, and to confirm the way forward with the community, based on ICANN organization's understanding of the public comments, in coordination with the ICANN Board through the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC).

Current Status: The public comment forum on short-term options pertaining to specific reviews was opened to address the current workload of the volunteer community and impact on ICANN resources; the comments received on this topic were limited in number, with support split across various options (see Summary of Public Comments [PDF, 225 KB]).

The public comment forum on long-term options provided more reasonable scheduling across ICANN reviews (Specific and Organizational), with the goal of meeting ICANN's accountability and transparency obligations in a more practical and sustainable manner. The long-term proposal garnered a number of comments, with general support for many of the principles, but no clear agreement on how to implement improvement (see Summary of Public Comments [PDF, 294 KB]).

The proposal "Consultation Paper on Next Steps on Reviews" [PDF, 120 KB] intends to confirm the way forward with the community, based on ICANN organization's understanding of the public comments, and in coordination with the ICANN Board through the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC). We are providing further opportunity for consultation due to the limited number of comments received; to confirm whether the responses received to date are broadly representative of the multistakeholder community views; and to harmonize divergence of opinions expressed by the responders. This consultation paper is posted for 30 days, due to the timing considerations for Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) and the importance of moving the work forward.

Next Steps: After this Public Comment closes, ICANN organization will analyze the comments received and coordinate with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board (OEC) in identifying recommendations to the Board on paths forward.

Section I: Description and Explanation

On 14 May 2018, ICANN organization opened two public comment forums: short-term options pertaining to specific reviews to address the current workload of the volunteer community and impact on ICANN resources and long-term options to provide more reasonable scheduling across ICANN reviews (Specific and Organizational), with the goal of meeting ICANN's accountability and transparency obligations in a more practical and sustainable manner. In response to community requests, ICANN organization extended the deadline for comments until 31 July 2018, resulting in a 78-day public comment period.

For short-term options, eight comments were received, with support split across three presented options (see Summary of Public Comments [PDF, 225 KB]). Long-term proposal garnered 10 comments, with general support for many of the principles, but no clear agreement on how to implement improvements – see Summary of Public Comments [PDF, 294 KB].

This consultation paper proposes a path forward with regards to short-term options, specifically for ATRT3; the means by which Specific Reviews and Organizational Reviews could be streamlined and improved in the long-term; and next steps toward finalizing and adopting Operating Standards. It is important to note that this consultation paper does not propose solutions for streamlining and improving reviews; it articulates the issues to be considered and a process by which this work could move forward.

Section II: Background

The comments received on short-term options to adjust the timeline of reviews were limited in number, with support split across various options (see Summary of Public Comments [PDF, 225 KB]). The long-term proposal garnered a number of comments, with general support for many of the principles, but no clear agreement on how to implement improvement (see Summary of Public Comments [PDF, 294 KB]).

The proposal "Consultation Paper on Next Steps on Reviews" [PDF, 120 KB] intends to confirm the way forward with the community, based on ICANN organization's understanding of the public comments, and in coordination with the ICANN Board through the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC). We are providing further opportunity for consultation due to the limited number of comments received, to confirm whether the responses received to date are broadly representative of the multistakeholder community views, and to harmonize divergence of opinions expressed by the responders.

Section III: Relevant Resources

- "Consultation Paper on Next Steps on Reviews" [PDF, 120 KB]
- Short-term Options to Adjust The Timeline of Reviews Public Comment Report [PDF, 225 KB]
- Long-term Options to Adjust The Timeline of Reviews Public Comment Report [PDF, 294 KB]
- ICANN Bylaws: Specific Reviews[https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#article4.6]
- ICANN Bylaws: Organizational Reviews[https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#article4.4]

Section IV: Additional Information

Section V: Reports

FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.

AL-ALAC-ST-1018-01-01-EN.pdf

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.

The ALAC appreciated the opportunity to comment on the next steps on Reviews

> **ATRT3 - Proposed Path Forward:** Commence ATRT3 to start its substantive work in January 2019. To achieve this target, the Board would ask for the community to reconfirm their review team nominees and for the SO/AC chairs to appoint the review team by 30 November 2018.

The ALAC supports the proposal.

> **Specific Reviews - Proposed Path Forward:** ATRT3 to consider undertaking a discussion on how to streamline Specific Reviews to make them more effective and impactful. ATRT3 could explore relevant input from: ICANN community (public comments on Long-term options and additional consultations), ICANN organization via observed best practices and opportunities for efficiencies from specific reviews conducted in the past year, and ICANN Board, via observations from OEC.
>
> ATRT3 discussions, guidance and potentially recommendations would inform next steps.

The ALAC considers this a low priority item for ATRT3. Based on recent experience, the reviews have largely worked well. What has not worked as well is the ICANN Org implementation which seems to focus far more on ticking off boxes than on addressing the intent of the recommendations.

> **Organizational Reviews - Proposed Path Forward:** Begin an effort to formulate a shared understanding of the purpose of Organizational Reviews and their expected outcomes - within the ICANN community, Board and ICANN organization. Identify potential options to accomplish the agreed upon purpose and expectations, with an eye toward improved efficiency and effectiveness. The goal would be to achieve a balanced outcome, resulting in an effective process with support from the community, while preserving transparent and consistent means of assessing SO/AC accountability to their stakeholders and a means of implementing meaningful improvements. The Board, through the OEC, would provide guidance and direction on the possible solutions, and community consultation would also take place.

The ALAC supports the proposal but with caution. We need not just change, but effective change. The Organizational Review process has been a HUGELY expensive (both financial and volunteer effort; both the review process proper and their implementations). It is not at all obvious that any benefits have come near to being commensurate with the efforts.

This cannot be a Board and/or ICANN Org effort "with consultation". There needs to be active community participation in formulating any recommendations.

> **Specific Reviews Operating Standards - Proposed Path Forward:** Rooted in practical experience over the past year with two post-transition-initiated reviews, ICANN organization will incorporate proposals based on significant lessons learned and include operational process improvements implemented within the past year. The next draft Operating Standards will be responsive to community concerns about selection of RT members, scope setting and monitoring progress of review teams with clear definition of escalation procedures, among others.

The ALAC supports this, but it must be done with GREAT CARE.

Institutionalizing things which have only had limited application can lead to unintended results. As an example, the first version of the Operating Standards went into excruciating detail where it was not warranted. It specified that all RTs must have Co-Chairs, because Co-Chairs were in vogue and were successful for the CWG-Stewardship Transition and the CCWG-Accountability. The RDS-WHOIS2-RT and now the reformed SSR2-RT decided that a Chair and Vice-Chairs made more sense.

As a second example, the first version of the Operating Standards specified a very cumbersome (in time and community effort) to define the scope of a review because of the PERCEIVED problem in one recent review. And it is far from clear whether that perception was even accurate.

As a third example (provided by the Chair of the RDS-WHOIS2-RT) the forced DETAILED planning has helped the RDS-WHOIS-Review develop and (roughly) keep to its schedule. But it only worked because the review team leadership was willing to consciously make specific changes even though it had committed to other timelines in its Terms of Reference. Agility, here, as in modern programming, is essential. On the other hand, adoption of report standards and careful adherence to then, has led to a bloated and largely inflated Draft Report.

Operating Standards should take a minimalist approach.

DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).

The ALAC appreciated the opportunity to comment on the next steps on Reviews

> **ATRT3 - Proposed Path Forward:** Commence ATRT3 to start its substantive work in January 2019. To achieve this target, the Board would ask for the community to reconfirm their review team nominees and for the SO/AC chairs to appoint the review team by 30 November 2018.

The ALAC supports the proposal.

> **Specific Reviews - Proposed Path Forward:** ATRT3 to consider undertaking a discussion on how to streamline Specific Reviews to make them more effective and impactful. ATRT3 could explore relevant input from: ICANN community (public comments on Long-term options and additional consultations), ICANN organization via observed best practices and opportunities for efficiencies from specific reviews conducted in the past year, and ICANN Board, via observations from OEC.
>
> ATRT3 discussions, guidance and potentially recommendations would inform next steps.

The ALAC considers this a low priority item for ATRT3. Based on recent experience, the reviews have largely worked well. What has not worked as well is the ICANN Org implementation which seems to focus far more on ticking off boxes than on addressing the intent of the recommendations.

> **Organizational Reviews - Proposed Path Forward:** Begin an effort to formulate a shared understanding of the purpose of Organizational Reviews and their expected outcomes - within the ICANN community, Board and ICANN organization. Identify potential options to accomplish the agreed upon purpose and expectations, with an eye toward improved efficiency and effectiveness. The goal would be to achieve a balanced outcome, resulting in an effective process with support from the community, while preserving transparent and consistent means of assessing SO/AC accountability to their stakeholders and a means of implementing meaningful improvements. The Board, through the OEC, would provide guidance and direction on the possible solutions, and community consultation would also take place.

The ALAC supports the proposal but with caution. We need not just change, but effective change. The Organizational Review process has been a HUGELY expensive (both financial and volunteer effort; both the review process proper and their implementations). It is not at all obvious that any benefits have come near to being commensurate with the efforts.

This cannot be a Board and/or ICANN Org effort "with consultation". There needs to be active community participation in formulating any recommendations.

> **Specific Reviews Operating Standards - Proposed Path Forward:** Rooted in practical experience over the past year with two post-transition-initiated reviews, ICANN organization will incorporate proposals based on significant lessons learned and include operational process improvements implemented within the past year. The next draft Operating Standards will be responsive to community concerns about selection of RT members, scope setting and monitoring progress of review teams with clear definition of escalation procedures, among others.

The ALAC supports this, but it must be done with GREAT CARE.

Institutionalizing things which have only had limited application can lead to unintended results. As an example, the first version of the Operating Standards went into excruciating detail where it was not warranted. It specified that all RTs must have Co-Chairs, because Co-Chairs were in vogue and were successful for the CWG-Stewardship Transition and the CCWG-Accountability. The RDS-WHOIS2-RT and now the reformed SSR2-RT decided that a Chair and Vice-Chairs made more sense.

As a second example, the first version of the Operating Standards specified a very cumbersome (in time and community effort) to define the scope of a review because of the PERCEIVED problem in one recent review. And it is far from clear whether that perception was even accurate.

As a third example (provided by the Chair of the RDS-WHOIS2-RT) the forced DETAILED planning has helped the RDS-WHOIS-Review develop and (roughly) keep to its schedule. But it only worked because the review team leadership was willing to consciously make specific changes even though it had committed to other timelines in its Terms of Reference. Agility, here, as in modern programming, is essential. On the other hand, adoption of report standards and careful adherence to then, has led to a bloated and largely inflated Draft Report.

Operating Standards should take a minimalist approach.