
PAT KANE:

You'll notice Pat and I and Jaap, and perhaps one or two others particularly from our Accountability and Transparency Review Team will have our videos on. We just thought it might give a little bit of depth and color and entertainment if you saw some of us moving. We're certainly not expecting all of you to put your video on, but if you want to, that's fine. If indeed we get unwanted attention, Brenda has her finger poised over the kill button and she will remove video from our option.

So we're now recording. It is just past the appointed half past the hour. And Pat, if you're happy, shall we get this started? I'm sure he's happy. Yeah, nodding there. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I'm joined today with Pat Kane, co-chair along with me, of the third Accountability and Transparency Review Team, and several—but unfortunately we don't think all—of our review team members.

we've got a number of slides to go through today, and what we'll do is try and give our review team members who've joined us, including Jaap, Vanda, Jacques, Daniel if he joins us, and Sébastien of course, an opportunity to at least read through one or so of the slides. So you won't just be hearing Pat and my voice. So let's get started, and we'll be asking Brenda to further the slides.

Just in case you don't know where you are, this is the first webinar of two of the third accountability and transparency review team, the ATRT3. Our webinar is regarding the ATRT3 final report, and we will be looking forward to taking your questions or comments in the chat,

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

although we will also have a little bit of time towards the end for Q&A where we will ask you to raise your hands and use your microphone. Please use the usual format of putting “question” and “question” at the beginning and end of something that you want to have read out, and we will make sure that we do that for you. And we will also take the time to read any comments that you preface and bookend with the [inaudible] preface as we go through.

So with no further ado, Brenda, if we can pop to the predictable slide. This is our agenda. We’re going to go through our background and scope, we’re going to take you through the overview of recommendations, something about next steps, and a little bit of Q&A. Next slide, please. And you may as well bounce all the way to the fourth. Thank you very much.

There's a little background there showing almost all of us, but those of us who were able to gather together in a face-to-face meeting that we held in Brussels, and we wanted to just humanize some of the slides so we thought we'd put that picture in. But our accountability and transparency review, the review of ICANN, is mandated in Article 4, Section 4.6 and we've outlined it here just for the record. ICANN's execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of our decision making at ICANN reflect public interests and are accountable to our community is the purpose and intent of everything we did.

Could we have done more? Yes, but we are limited as a review, as a specific review, to have a one-year term. And thanks to the world going

crazy, we in fact extended that this time under the unusual circumstances to in fact hand in our homework just a little bit late, but we're very pleased with having it done pretty much on time. Next slide, please.

What did we cover? What we managed to do was, apart from visit with a lot of you in your parts and component parts of ICANN when we were able to hold face-to-face meetings, ATRT3 assessed and reviewed and made reaction and in some cases comments and recommendations on the following scoped items: we looked at ICANN board governance, the role and effectiveness of the Government Advisory Committee, the processes by which ICANN receives its public input, the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by our community at ICANN and the wider Internet community as well.

We looked at the policy development process but with a light touch, particularly because ATRT2, our predecessor had gone into that with a great deal of detail. And when we were doing our work, a pivotal piece of work within ICANN, at least within the Generic Name Supporting Organization, was coming towards its end with what is now known as the PDP 3.0 in the GNSO so we certainly kept a light touch on that. But we were working very closely with watching how that was developing.

We also looked at to what extent the ATRT2 recommendations had been implemented up until the time we were doing our work and any effectiveness that we could see of any of their implementations. We looked at the independent review processes and we'll take you into greater detail on that in particular. We also looked at accountability and transparency in the framework of the strategic and operating plans that

ICANN runs at regular and cyclical intervals, and of course, we note that that in itself is something that has been changing recently.

We of course looked at specific and organizational reviews, and we looked at what some of us thought was extremely important. One of the big ones was the prioritization and rationalization of the activities to do with policy recommendations coming out of various review processes. Yes, all in 12 months. Next slide, please.

We put all of that through the framed lens of something some of you, if not all of you, will be familiar with now. It's called the SMART system. We've got a little pretty graphic there if you want to go into the details of that process. But it's certainly a mechanism that from now on you will see much more in all review processes.

What we did was, just to give you a little bit of framing, we managed to get our final report into the board on 1st of June 2020, and we've got this report open until 31 July. And obviously, this review is to offer an opportunity for some interaction and explanation on the five—five only—recommendations that we made regarding ICANN's accountability and transparency. We worked and we were the first review process to work under new operating guidelines, operational standards for specific reviews. So we sort of beta tested that. And to that end, that is why we applied this fact-based analysis system, this SMART framework to everything we did.

Could we have come up with more recommendations? Yes. But these five recommendations are very significant and are the ones that we felt worked best within this particular framework and are the most

meaningful for this point in time in ICANN's evolution. We reached full consensus on four of the recs—not all of them—and we reached consensus on all of the recommendations, so the one pertaining to amending specific and organizational reviews. Next slide, please.

This reflects the, could e have done more? Absolutely. And we have got a list of things that, yes, we recognize were going on within the wonderful world of ICANN during our work. But of course, we were not—and I've put a COVID bug there because Pat and I felt we'd brightened it up and we certainly didn't think we could ignore the fact that the world has changed. But we didn't go into details about what the consequences of COVID-19 are for ICANN.

We didn't go into details—although we were very aware—that there's a number of accountability and transparency issues relating specifically to domain name system abuse, whether or not that goes along with COVID. We did not go into details but are in some cases painfully aware of the expedited policy development process which was running of course in parallel through our work. And we also did not, but were very aware of what was going on with the proposed changes at the time, although this is now settled to some extent at least, of the proposed change of ownership through the .org registry. Next slide, please. And very shortly, you will be not having to listen to my dulcet tones.

We've got a list of annexes, and they are significant. They form an important part of our report, and they are listed there for your reading pleasure. We're delighted to see that all of our work came out in the languages fairly close to the initial publication date, so this should be something that's quite easy for all—we hope—of our ICANN community

and wider Internet community to look at. I'm going to hand over to Pat, and he's also going to introduce, as we go through, a couple of our leadership team who will take us through other slides. Pat, that's it from me until the end. Over to you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on the call today. Thank you for joining us, and I hope that the situations around the world are finding you as well as you can be. So if we could go to slide ten, please, Brenda.

So Cheryl laid out the five areas to where we had made recommendations and the consensus that we had on each of them. We looked at what to do around periodic and organizational reviews. You'll see a new term that's been introduced as the holistic review that we recommended. We had consensus around that one. You will see that there are three minority statements within the report, authored by four of our members from a four out of 18. Just in terms of how we got the consensus when we actually had the vote, one was not present. He'd taken some time off because of needs. And then one had abstained as far as the vote, so we determined that we had consensus.

The second item we looked at was prioritization and what we could do around that, how to better use funds, personnel, time, taking a look at the accountability indicators, of how does ICANN measure performance or success against the accountability indicators, taking a look at how ICANN receives public input, and taking a look again at the ATRT2 recommendations, which, one of the things that we touched upon

throughout was that there were a significant number of recommendations that came out of ATRT2 that were determined by the organization to be complete when in fact when we did the analysis, they were either actually not complete or attributed something that was actually not intended in the actual recommendation, which kind of drove a lot of the recommendations around prioritization and around the reviews themselves.

So those last four, as Cheryl indicated, were full consensus across the team, and now we're going to go through some details on that. Daniel, if you're ready, I'm going to ask you to go through the next two slides and talk about the specific and organizational review recommendation, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

I'd like to request you to go to the next slide as we go through the specific recommendation. So to govern this, we identified that there are too many specific and organizational reviews that occur simultaneously. So this led to a lot of confusion between the community, which reviews to follow or how the respective outcomes would happen. And the intended outcome was to significantly improve the use of resources within the SOs and ACs as to the specific and organizational reviews and spread this out to improve the timing and cadence of these reviews.

Then also, another, we intended to restructure the specific and organizational reviews to ensure that they are effective and to continue to have a purpose. And the recommendations include to suspend the RDS and the SSR reviews until the next ATRT, and one additional CCT

review. Evolve the organizational reviews into continuous improvement programs into each SO and AC and the NomCom, and also to add holistic review as a special specific review, looking at all the SO, AC, NomCom and their relations. Another recommendation was to implement a new system for the timing and the cadence of the reviews. Next slide, please.

And also, further on the suggestions was that the ATRT makes a further suggestion to its recommendation letter to the ICANN board which the board invited the comment and feedback during the public comment proceeding.

Given this recommendation is quoted there, I'll read it. Given the recommendation in section eight of the ATRT3 report proposing significant changes to organizational reviews and specific reviews, ATRT3 strongly suggests that ICANN board implements a moratorium on launching any new organizational reviews, specific reviews, until it has made a decision on these recommendations. In case we need to get more details on this, you can look up in the annex. Next slide, please. And I'll hand over the floor to Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Daniel. Sébastien, if you would take us through 13 and 14, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Pat, and thank you all for participating to this call. We are in the assessment of the reviews and going on, following on continuous

improvement. What we suggest is that ICANN shall evolve the content of organizational review into continuous improvement program in each SO, AC, and the NomCom, and this continuous improvement program can and needs to be worked out between ICANN Org and each SO, AC, and the NomCom.

The goal is to have some common basis between all the part of the organization, but it will also allow some customization. It's where we need to have this discussion between SO, AC, NomCom and ICANN Organization-. And it shall be implemented within the next 18months of this recommendation being approved by the board. And one of the items that need to be included is annual satisfaction survey, and I guess the next slide is about this topic, annual satisfaction survey of members and participants. Next slide, please.

Each SO, AC, NomCom shall perform a comprehensive annual satisfaction survey or equivalent mechanism. Survey should be focused on member satisfaction, and if there are other issues, of course, they can put them in both the SOs and the ACs and the NomCom and the one answering could put other item if they wish. The goal is really to have satisfaction from all parts of the organization, including also the services given by ICANN Org.

For SO and AC that's composed by substructure, we think it's important to go to those substructure and not to the main structure, and do both. The result will be public and used for support the continuous improvement program by each SO, AC, NomCom, but also by the holistic review, and I guess we'll come back on that later on. And if there is not a significant issue, this shall be the trigger to initiate appropriate

measure to deal with any such issue. I guess I give you back the floor, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Sébastien. And Vanda, if you will take us through Slide 15, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you very much for all that following our discussion. It was very interesting discussion, and we hope we have a lot of questions. [While continuous assessment of reviews,] the regular assessment of continuous improvement program should at least every three years be done. Each SO, AC, NomCom will undertake a formal process to evaluate and report on its continuous improvement activities which will be published for public comment. This would allow the holistic review, as Sébastien said, we're going to do this later on, to consider a minimum of two assessment reports and related public comments for each SO, AC, NomCom. Details of the assessment will be defined during the elaboration of the continuous improvement program with each SO, AC, NomCom. If the SO, AC, NomCom desires and their budget permits, the assessment can be conducted by an independent contractor, or by having an intensive one- to five-day workshop. The board should publish at least every three years a summary of its continuous improvement over that period. Those reports would be used as an input for the holistic review work. Thank you. Back to you, or I can continue.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. So Jaap, will you take us through slide 16, please?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes, let me do that. So as some people [inaudible], the continuous improvement program is not meant to be a cost saving action and during the whole period. As said on previous slide, outside contractors could help with the assessments as well. [Therefore, I can stay assured] that the same budget is available for these continuous improvement efforts of the various ACs and SOs.

The public comment on reporting of continuous improvement is only required every three years, and whatever process is really selected for doing this continuous improvement, it should fit into the financial [inaudible] available for the activities as [inaudible] by the board. And let's now go to slide 17.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jaap. So the second area that we took a look at from a recommendation standpoint was the prioritization of recommendations coming from the community, and the problem statement that we addressed was there's no clear or consistent methodology that existed for formulating how we address these particular recommendations. Our intended outcome in this area was to help determine a process that we could formalize this prioritization process across review recommendations as well as cross-community working group recommendations.

To do that, we recommended that we create a community-led entity that's tasked with operating this prioritization process, because these recommendations are all coming from the community. We specifically determined it should not be ICANN Org or ICANN board in and of themselves, but they should be participating. A member from each of the SOs and ACs to be participating if they would like, but not necessarily required. Next slide, please.

So the high-level guidance that we had for this prioritization process was to operate through a consensus process across SOs, ACs, board and Org members such that we can go through this.

Now, it's not just about how we prioritize what's been recommended, we've also talked about how to retire what's been recommended over a period of time, should the recommendations be overcome by events or they just don't match some of the considerations that we have at the bottom of the page. It needs to be integrated within the standard operating processes and be a formal step in the financial planning process for the organization and the community.

We did want to call out one specific item around multi-year implementations that they should also be subject to an annual review. So if it's a two- or three-year program, we shouldn't just assume that because it gets prioritized in one year, it actually is prioritized for three years. Because at the end of every year, we should assess each of the projects around the recommendations such that if something no longer makes sense, we should stop spending money on it at that point in time and just drive to what the recommendations are that come out of this group.

So from a consideration standpoint, I'll just read through these. Relevance to ICANN's mission, commitments, core values, strategic objectives, the value and impact of the implementation, what the cost is and what available budget there is, what is the complexity, what is the time to implement? Are these recommendations tied to other recommendations from both a complementary and a competitive situation? And any other relevant information that could come from the shepherds.

I think one of the things that we recognized was that shepherd participation is really important so that the intent of the recommendations can be carried through as opposed to, I think what we identified in our review of the ATRT2 recommendations, at the end when we did that, we weren't actually certain what was actually recommended and had to go back and talk to some of the people from ATRT2 itself. Next slide, please.

So, in terms of accountability and transparency for the strategic and operating plans, one of the items that we talked about here is that we're having trouble with measuring some of the recommendations that are coming out of the strategic plan for 21 to 25. As we take a look at some of the examples, there's what's the intent of the project and what's the intent of the plan, but not necessarily what the value of the item is, how it's going to measure, and what does good look like, what does success look like.

So as we went through some of the accountability indicators, which we'll see on the next slide I believe, and I'm going to give it to Jacques at that point in time, is that when we put the accountability indicators up

and we put the metrics in place, they have to actually tell the right story to say, have we been successful? And we think we're missing that from the strategic plan as well the accountability indicators.

So Jacques, you're up next.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yeah, so public input, so one of the things we saw ongoing was public comments as proposed by ICANN tend to reach a stagnation. And so we've seen ICANN using alternative methods increasing for trying to capture this input that we miss, that ICANN misses, and using alternative methods [that sounded as] good. But the problem is they are nowhere in the bylaws. So they might be either, again, the stated rules, or without any clear rules for their use.

So the outcome that we saw were, how do we increase participation in the public comments, and if we do have to think about alternate mechanisms, clarifications should be pushed forward as to gather better input. So establishing and publishing clear reporting requirements for alternate mechanism should be part of the ATRT3 recommendations and at the minimum, a consistent application of the published rules would have to be related to public input.

So there's a clear recommendation here that ICANN Org shall institute changes to public comment proceedings. And beyond these slides, part of the issue we have here is, how do we better address the community and how does ICANN [budget federate] the community so the empowerment and all the tools that are given to us as a community are used along the way so we all participate into ICANN's life and ICANN

multi-stakeholder model, really. That's what's at stake here. Next slide, please.

So now we go to assessment of ATRT2 implementation. Pat, up to where do you want me to go here?

PAT KANE:

So this is the last slide that we've got on detailing the recommendation, so Jacques, if you could close this one out, please.

JACQUES BLANC:

Okay. ATRT2 implementation. A couple of things here. The first thing we have noted when we started working as ATRT3 is we were far away from ATRT2. First, we were far away in time because all these recommendations took place a while ago. And second, we were the first ATRT group after ICANN has been separated.

So ATRT3, similar to other specific reviews, had to assess the ATRT2 recommendations. And we have seen that not all recommendations had been completely implemented. And what's more is not all the recommendations had been implemented, but some of them we assesses non implemented, were flagged as implemented by ICANN Org. So we had a disagreement here, so we had to reassess every recommendation and hear from our point of view which were implemented and which not.

The outcome here is that we had to see if all the ATRT2 recommendations would have to be implemented or could still be implemented, because both ICANN and all the community and Internet

had changed in the meantime. So, could we recommend that all the ATRT2 recommendations would be implemented, or would we have to prioritize to see which are the ones that would be still applicable, and in some cases, would some of the previous ATRT2 recommendations have to be declared foreclosed, for example?

So the overall recommendation here is we think that ICANN Org should review again the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations in the light of this new ATRT assessment. So we can distinguish these which are complete, which should be implemented, and if they are not, prioritize what should be done and how it should be done, because as we will see further, there's a lot of work on the table at the moment and prioritization is key here.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Jacques. So that is the high-level detail of the five recommendations that the ATRT3 team generated. And if we could go to two slides forward, please, Brenda. So we'll take a look at our next steps. As Cheryl indicated earlier, we submitted the final report to the board on the 1st of June. The final report is available for public comment through the end of July, and then we anticipate that we will see board action on these recommendations by December 1 2020.

We have a team of implementation shepherds that will be able to provide any information or clarifications throughout implementation on what we see below, the intent of the recommendations, the rationale for recommendations, timeline, and metrics and how do we judge success in these particular areas.

So that's where we are on that. Cheryl, if you would close us out, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. We hope you note that we have captured a couple of our questions as we come through, so we will go to that as well. We've left plenty of time for questions and discussions, which was our intent. But Brenda, if we can move through the next slide, which is the list of annexes. Just briefly, I wanted to remind you all that there are a number of important annexes, not only in the report but also in this presentation, and indeed, this presentation is published—or will be published if it isn't already—with the speaker notes, because there is a lot more information extracted from our report that goes into specifics that you'll find in the speaker notes. But we figured, rather than read through laboriously, we'd be having a light touch on the imagery and provide the greater details in some annexes and the speaker notes that is going along with this presentation.

So in this presentation, you will find details of the ATRT3 composition, and you can move just to that slide if you like, Brenda, where we list as you can see not only who of us are there but from whence we came. In our report itself, we also had our full attendances also listed. The other annexes do go into details on our methodology, the specifics of our project timeline and our milestones, so exactly how our work was, and we also gave details on the assessment of our reviews and the specific details and useful links.

Back one more now to Q&A, and we will go through our list. I wanted to also note that KC Claffy, another one of our review team members is with us today, so we'll ask her to interact in Q&A if she wants to. I don't think I see anyone else from our team in this call, but different people will be joining for the following call in however many hours that is.

So we did cover off a couple, or at least one question regarding what is the measurement, the criteria used for consensus and full consensus in chat, but Steve DelBianco did raise the question earlier on, and let me read it to the record and we'll respond. He made a comment, I should say, about still no organizational review for the Government Advisory Committee. I might get Pat to respond to that, and perhaps Sébastien will follow through, as well as Vanda if they'd like to. But of course, the approach of holistic reviewing is one that we believe will allow us to capture those parts of ICANN which currently don't have the formal organizational review approach. Pat, did you want to follow on to that comment from Steve?

PAT KANE:

No, Cheryl, I think you covered it right there, is that the holistic review is where we're trying to capture how the organization works together. It's one thing to take a look at each organization, but there has not been a holistic or a complete organizational review in how we interact since, I believe, 2002 that we've had some kind of full review of the entire organization. So that's intended to be captured in that. So thank you, Steve.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this. I have neglected to scroll far enough through. I have noted that Tola Sogbesan is also one of our review team members and I want to call him out and thank him for joining us today. So just pop your hand up if you would like to respond to any of these questions, Tola. Vanda and Sébastien, did you want to make any further comments on this comment from Steve DelBianco? If not, we'll move on to the question from Nadira.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, I guess Patrick just covered all the answers. I have nothing else to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Steve, if you wish, you can go to page 82 of the report. [You have, I guess, the only major of the whole report who can] be useful to be part of the answer of your question, because we tried to put all the information about timing of each and every review and who groups could be covered. It's not in stone yet because each SO, AC will work on that with ICANN Org. But it gives some idea on how it could be organized. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Now, if there's no one else who wanted to respond to that comment, we'll go to the question posted by

Nadira Alaraj. And thank you for your question as well. The question is, who are members of the Nominating Committee to cover the satisfaction surveys? So these surveys we've referred to as an important part of the process to contribute to the organizational aspects of continuous improvement. Are they the receiving bodies? And of course, our Nominating Committee is an unusual beast, but it of course has a turnover of membership. It is a fresh Nominating Committee technically every year, although people do serve in a Nominating Committee over a couple of years, so there is some continuity there. So an annual survey will pick up some continuity from membership of the Nominating Committee. But most importantly, we would assume, having interacted with Nominating Committee—and I wanted to note a number of the members, including Tom, the chair of the Nominating Committee review implementation working group, is with us on today's call, that part of the process—and we did work with that review implementation working group as well—part of that group's recommendations that they're implementing is a more stable body of members who are experienced in the Nominating Committee world which have a continuity across from year to year. And Nadira, you're on that team, so you know that very well, I am sure. And we would include that group as well as of course the leadership at least of the receiving bodies. At least that's how we envisage that recommendation to be operated.

Remember, of course, that our recommendations in themselves also need to go through an implementation phase, and our stewards, which Pat described, are going to be very closely working with how ICANN Org implements our recommendations. I'll invite any of our team to respond to Nadira's questions on the Nominating Committee, noting that Vanda

of course is another one of the people who've got a foot in both the review implementation working group and our ATRT3 team. Vanda, did you want to pick up on anything?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I believe Nadira is also well knowing about the formal of NomCom, and I do believe that even with the new group that is suggesting some modifications for the NomCom will allow much more opportunities for this continuous improvement program be very useful for NomCom. So I do believe that even now it is good, but from now on, after the implementation of the review of NomCom, I do believe it will be much more opportune to have this improvement continually for the NomCom, and they will see much more results from there, even for comparing with other that has more stable groups, NomCom will really work to use this continuous improvement for their own. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Vanda. Steve, I'm going to come to your question in chat, but I notice Abdulkarim Oloyede has his hand up, so Abdulkarim, over to you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. My question has to do with the public comments. I think you have some wonderful recommendations in terms of the public comment. But one areas which I'm a little bit concerned about is in terms of how those public comments—the comments received during the public comment, how they're actually taken into

consideration. What I was thinking was there was going to be something as to how to benchmark [we received this] comment and this is how we actually took this comment into consideration. Because I think in terms of transparency, it's not enough to say this is the outcome, but to actually say this is how we got to the outcome. I think that's an important element of transparency. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Abdulkarim. And perhaps I can respond to that, and then ask the rest of our team to make any other comments as well. Or Pat, did you want to have a bat at that one before, as you know, I'm busting to? He's saying no.

PAT KANE: You've got it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Abdulkarim, the work we did in our own report that you will see in, I think quite laborious, detail is also the type of accountability and transparency recordings that you see in most of the policy development processes. And of course, public comment is not limited to policy development processes in the world of ICANN, as I know you know very well. But let's use that as an example here.

and how public comments are dealt with in fact go back to recommendations that came out of the initial ATRT1. And I want to recognize Fiona Alexander who escaped this one—and I'm not sure, she went through hell and high water to do so, I suspect, but Fiona of

course worked with a department within the United States that had our accountability and transparency very much in their clutches, and I'd welcome her input as well here if she would like to. But one of the recommendations came out of the very first work in accountability and transparency that ICANN did, what seems like a million years ago now, recommended something that we have seen ever since and has now become an operational standard within most parts of ICANN, and that is where a great deal of time in public meeting mode—so every word that is said and discussed with certainly any of the review teams or the policy development working groups or the drafting teams is available for public to at least listen to and interact with, but most importantly, a piece of any reporting includes a reference and excerpt of every single public comment received. How that public comment was in fact looked at, discussed and what the response of the process or the group that are doing the process—in our case, our review team—was. So if you've made a public comment, what the review team said, did and thought about that comment, how it was or was not in any way, shape or form put into any form of recommendation is also recorded, and then you've got a tracking, a mapping, if you will, that takes what I said in public comment, what influence it did or did not have in the process, and what the outcome was in a long lasting and physical term.

So that's a process that's been refined over years. It's a process that we did not see we needed to make particular recommendation changes to, but we certainly made, as you note, what we think are important recommendations that will allow more interaction and wider availability of access in the public comment processes.

Let me now go back to our question from Steve, unless any of our other review team people wanted to respond to Abdulkarim's comment. Vanda, you do. Please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

No, just to remember that Susan Kawaguchi has a question. But since she could not put question in the beginning and the end, maybe it's not considered as a question. So it's important—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'll grab that one. Before Susan, however, we've got another question from Steve DelBianco. So let's dig into that. We've got a little bit of time, and then we'll also read what Susan said to the record and any reaction. So Steve DelBianco asks in chat, what is the scope of the holistic reviews, and could it recommend changes to structure and composition of the ICANN board and the GNSO for example? Are the AC, SO self-assessments intended to match the AC, SO accountability recommendations that were approved in Work Stream 2?

Well, I'm going to ask—I note, Vanda, your hand is still up, but I'm going to ask first of all Sébastien, I think, to bite into that response. I will then come back to the rest of the team to pick up anything else. Sébastien, would you like to respond to Steve DelBianco's question, please?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and thank you, Steve, for your question. The goal—and you know ICANN since a long time, Steve, but for all the other, we didn't get to a holistic review or whatever was the name since

2002, as Pat said in the presentation. And at that time, a lot of things happened to ICANN where the DNSO were, I can say, split between ccNSO and GNSO, and the ALAC and At-Large was created and so on and so forth, NomCom and so on.

And therefore, this holistic review is to have the capability to look to the whole picture of ICANN, and if it seems to be relevant to make some changes in the relation between bodies or in the way ICANN is organized to take better into account what ICANN needs to do and has to do. Yes, it's an open possibility, and of course, the board composition is one part of this discussion and reflection that the holistic review could have.

And I guess, Cheryl, you are better suited to answer the second question because you were in charge of this AC, SO accountability within Work Stream 2. I give you back the floor. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sébastien. And I guess I could just briefly say the answer is yes, which is very brief, but I also would recognize that Steve DelBianco, who as you know is on the call, was also part of the team that along with me helped shepherd the thinking of the accountability recommendations that were approved by Work Stream 2. So yes, it certainly would be doing that, Steve. So we were very cognizant of that as we were planning it. But as you also know, the devil is in the detail, and that is why we think the shepherding process on the actual implementation of recommendations including any that go with these holistic reviews going forward, is critical and a piece of critical thinking.

I'll just read Susan's comment/question from the chat to the record. And thank you very much for this, Susan. There is a common theme from review teams that the previous recommendations were not fully implemented although ICANN Org states they were. Would the community-led entity tasked with prioritization address the previous recommendations also?

And Pat, no way am I not going to toss this one to you. Over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, Cheryl, because if you didn't, I was going to wrestle it away. Susan, thanks for that. And this is one of the areas to where we had a lot of conversations, and when we end up with only 60-65% of the recommendations that we agreed upon were actually completed, and 20+% were actually not done pretty much at all, that really is a failure. And trying to assign where that failure comes from was a lot of the conversation we had. Was it the review process? Was it ICANN Organization itself?

And I think where we came out at the end was that given the change in the process and the introduction of shepherds, along with the prioritization recommendations where we can retire recommendations that come out of review teams or CCWGs, that we've taken away the incentive for people to say, "Yes, I've done my work, yes, I'm complete," because the objective is not to complete everything but to complete those items that are prioritized. And the areas where we had items that were—something else was attributed to the recommendation that really didn't match and so we missed the intent, the shepherds

hopefully will take care of that through the process to say, “Here's what we meant.”

And I think the shepherds that we have isn't just one from ATRT3. I think we've got five or maybe even six that will participate in that through the process.

So my belief is that while that is a common theme between shepherds and prioritization, we should be able to end up and take that incentive away to declare victory when there's not one, because it's okay to say we're not going to do this by this community-led group. So thanks for this question. Great question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Indeed. And if I can just embellish one tiny bit more, the other thing that I think is important here is that ICANN Org itself—and remember, this review team had active participation, not just liaison but active member-based participation at the highest levels from the ICANN board, so there is a clear understanding of the concerns and changes are already being put in place as to how one can map and track what tended to happen in a lot of those issues, Susan, as you well know. They were passed off, and in the passing off to another part of ICANN or to another process—Work Stream 2 was a good example—that then got declared as a completion. So that won't be the modus operandi going forward. There will be a far more transparent tracking and mapping method, and of course, our fabulous team were very keen to make sure that that was a knitted in part, and you'll find that in the details in our—we do apologize for—very lengthy report.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're coming up to the end of our established hour, and Pat and myself and the rest of the team want to thank each and every one of you for taking the time to join us today. We hope you'll also take the time to read in the details. And we have an enormous amount of details for your reading pleasure in our report.

We remain available, of course, if you e-mail the staff support that you will find on the public comments page, you can get to us, we will respond, we will come and send some of our team to present to any of the component parts of our ICANN community to assist in any deliberations.

We think, whilst we only have five recommendations, they're five incredibly important ones, and we look forward to seeing the opportunity and change within ICANN as it evolves, as well as its component parts that we believe is more than potential. It needs to be actualized with the board, we hope, taking our recommendations and the Org, we trust, making the implementation of these cross-ICANN as easy, as efficient and as effective as it possibly can be.

I did want to just note one compliment that we got in chat in these last couple of seconds from Fiona Alexander, because we do value someone whose job it was to make sure the accountability and transparency of ICANN and indeed the operations of these ATRTs, current and past, and the other specific reviews, went the way it was intended. She notes that she thinks that we didn't do too much of a darn bad job.

All of your chat will be captured and it will be, of course, taken into account as the responses to public comments are looked at. We're at

our appointed hour of closing, and with that, as we wrap up, we want to say one more thank you so much. We're here to help, we hope you receive our report well, and we look forward to your public comments. So with that, Brenda, thank you so much and I wanted to note our fabulous staff who were here on today's call. Thank you to all of you. We would have not done as good a job without you, and that includes, of course, our technical writer, Bernie. Thanks for joining as well.

With that, thanks, one and all, and bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]