DEVAN REED:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large policy session three, ICANN accountability and transparency in the ICANN reviews on Wednesday the 20th of October 2021 at 17:00 UTC.
	In order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call today. However, attendance will be noted from the Zoom room as well as the audio bridge. We have Spanish, French and Russian interpretation on today's call.
	If you need a dial out to the Spanish, French or Russian lines, please send a direct message to staff with your preferred language and phone number.
	Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name when taking the floor each and every time and to speak slowly and clearly for accurate interpretation. When speaking, please also silence any notifications or alarms and please keep up microphone muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the floor over to Sébastien.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you very much. And with Heather Forrest, we'll try to moderate these two sessions. We will start with this first hour where we will have input from a lot of different groups within ICANN and the second hour will be dedicated to exchanges and discussion. And I would like to start by thanking all the speakers and participants to be here with us, and I

suggest that we launch the video. I am not as good as Jonathan Zuck, I have not the skill yet and the knowledge, but I'll try to do my best. I hope it will be okay with you.

This video is presenting the accountability and transparency review team number three, ATRT3, recommendations and the Board action regarding those recommendations. And we will go into more detail about ICANN accountability and transparency and the ICANN reviews.

ATRT3 sent five recommendations to the Board. One is about public input with low priority. [inaudible] is about assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations, also with a low priority. Then accountability and transparency relating to strategic and operational plans, including accountability indicators, here with a medium priority.

[inaudible] prioritization reviews and cross-community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability Work Stream 2 recommendation with high priority. Last but not least, assessment of specific and organizational reviews, with also here high priority. Those are the five recommendations from ATRT3.

Now let's go into more detail about this last one, assessment of specific and organizational reviews and see some element of the ATRT3 recommendation to the Board and ICANN Org. Let's start with organizational reviews.

ATRT3 recommendation was to evolve the content of the organizational reviews into continuous improvement program in each supporting organization, advisory committee and the Nominating Committee.

The Board approved this proposal subject to prioritization and the gathering of more information. At the same time, Board directs ICANN Org to initiate the development of a project plan to implement a pilot continuous improvement program.

Now let's go to the assessment of specific reviews. Suspend any further review regarding registration directory services and security, stability and resiliency until ATRT4. Allow one additional Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice review following the next round of new gTLD. Continue with ATRT reviews with a modified schedule and scope. Implement a new system for the timing and cadence of the review. And add holistic review as a special specific review which will look at all supporting organization, advisory committee and the Nominating Committee and their relations.

Regarding the three first one, it's approve, subject to prioritization and community agreement, to the bylaw change. Regarding the new timing and cadence, let's see what was the proposal of ATRT3. After the end of the previous cycle of reviews, ATRT3 suggested to start the next cycle by first holistic review beginning in 2020.

As for the Board, it'll be a pilot. Maybe the community can start the planning now. And then the continuous improvement program can be discussed in each ICANN group to start the planification in the next few

months, with a goal to have every three years an assessment to be shared with the other groups and to feed the holistic review. The date for the CCT review will of course depend on the new possible round of new gTLDs and ATRT reviews will be in cadence with the holistic ones.

Let's see what the Board decision regarding the holistic review was. It is approved subject to prioritization, the gathering of more information and the plan to organize the holistic review. Bylaw changes will depend on the result of the first holistic review, effectiveness of the pilot and the community agreement. And for that, the Board direct ICANN Org to initiate the first holistic review as a pilot and to define the timeline.

It's where our discussions start. And now we will have almost a speaker from each ICANN structure, starting by ATRT3 co-chair, then Board members, an ICANN Org voice and ICANN community structure representative. Now it's time to give the floor to Cheryl Langdon-Orr and then Pat Kane who were the ATRT3 co-chairs. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We've been asked, as we start our very short interventions here, to mention first of all what we're responsible for within ICANN. After many years in ICANN, I'm going to be able to say by the need of next week, I'm not going to be responsible for anything at all. I'm happy to declare that.

That being said, we as a team in ATRT3 were very much responsible for these recommendations. And Pat and I had the honor and privilege of working together as co-chairs. And whilst our role was obviously very

EN

much administrative in making sure the very compressed time scale could be utilized to the best of our ability with the full team, I think it's important to recognize that—and I'm going to take you back up now to that 30,000-foot view because Sébastien has taken us through quite a detailed—and I think there should be no questions based on what our recommendations were, where they were in our own priority from ATRT3 and indeed where we thought the importance was.

Now, I personally would like to stick back up to the 30,000-foot view and just remind you all that one of the things that the full ATRT3 was able to agree on—and that was that while we recognize and we certainly supported the importance of the process of review—I'm well known as a great fan of the review process in general and in ICANN in particular, but the process we are currently locked into was no longer fit for purpose, to put not too fine a point on it. You saw that very complicated timeline overlapping and all sorts of things that Sébastien showed. It simply was not working.

We also noted and agreed upon that whilst we have hardcoded into the bylaws certain requirements for types of organizational specific reviews, those reviews and the process that was being undertaken in them was also really no longer truly fit for purpose, and certainly, we were getting some administrative issues as a result of the fixed cadence and the requirements associated with them.

So what we thought we would do—and that was where our recommendations came from—was to look at an opportunity for a new level set for new mechanisms, for something that the whole of ICANN

EN

has not had an opportunity to do since the early 2000s, and that is to see where we are as a community as a whole.

And after I've taken you in light and fluffy clouds, Pat's going to now take over. Over to you, and you're going to dig into this holistic review a little bit more. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. I appreciate that. So Sébastien suggested that we take a look and talk about the holistic review today, which is really good because I get a lot of questions about what did we intend to and how far does it expand and what is the scope. And I think [inaudible] to just start off with where the objectives are and where we started from.

So when we think about the organizational reviews and moving from a large review on the whole structure and moving organizational reviews to continuous improvement efforts and so that we could have discrete pieces of work worked upon within each of the organizations over time, that that would really allow us to do something that we can say, how do we evolve from there into something that is taking a look at how the structure works around those organizations.

So our first objective was to only review from the organizations in holistic review the continuous improvement processes themselves. Don't second guess the outcomes, don't take a look at what topics were suggested or rejected, but take a look specifically at the continuous improvement processes such that, did we achieve an outcome that was usable? Did we achieve a work product that was implementable?

That's what we talked about from a first objective so that when we get to the holistic review and taking a look at what the main purpose of that is, which is to take a look at the effectiveness of the inter-SO/AC/NC communications and collaboration mechanisms, and that being how I've talked about this in the past, is managing the whitespace within an organization. How do we make certain that the interactions, the commitments and the accountabilities between different structures, organizations within the overall ICANN organism communicate and work together better.

Making an analogy on the human body, the lungs and the heart have specific jobs. How they transfer oxygen to get it out to the body is what the holistic review is supposed to take a look at. How do the groups interact with one another?

The third objective that we had was to make certain that the SOs and ACs are actually accountable to their constituent parts. So we take a look and say the people that are part of that organization, are they getting what they expect out of that organization themselves?

And then the last objective that we had was to determine as a whole the purposes within the ICANN structure. And we call that specifically here changes in structures and operations. And I think it's important when we talk even about the low priority item that we had about public input, when we take a look at new processes that generate work products that are outside of what we've been accustomed to—and I think two that jump to my mind are the development of frameworks and specifically like the technical study groups. Those are outcomes and

those are working groups that produce documents that are outcomes. What's the objective and what's the obligations around those work products? And then what's the review process between that? Are we getting what we expect to get out of that, and is it contributing to the development of consensus policy processes and consensus policies at the outcome that actually better the community?

So at a high level, those are the objectives around the holistic review. So when we get to questions, I'm open to taking questions at this point in time. So Cheryl, anything you want to add there? Or Sébastien, back to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess now it's time for Board inputs, please.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sébastien. As you know, the Board took action on the report of the ATRT3 on November the 30th 2020. And as you highlighted in the video that you presented as an introduction, all recommendations were approved, including the 15 component parts on each of those recommendations.

And of course, there are certain things that need to be looked at at a more detailed level. And to set an example, the holistic review is something that apparently has been a bit controversial in its approval because it's been approved to be carried out as a pilot. And what we mean as a pilot is—and we've had discussions around this—it's not a

EN

mini holistic review but instead a full holistic review that will allow us to understand and to learn from that process. That's why we are calling it a pilot. And again, there are certain dependencies, certain other areas that will be impacted by this holistic review. Of course, the bylaws could be one of these areas and the very structure of the different ICANN components could also be impacted by this holistic review. So that's why we want Org, the community and the Board to be cautious about the holistic review instead of just diving into the holistic review and navigating unchartered territory as it would be if we just dived into it directly. We want to be cautious, again, and we want to carry this holistic review as a pilot, but again emphasizing that this doesn't mean that it is a mini review or anything lesser than what is intended or how we understand the ATRT3, the holistic review, to be carried out. But again, as a process that will help us learn and that will help us better understand how this holistic review may be carried out and the different impact that it may have in the different structures and the different components of the ICANN community.

So with that, I would like to of course turn it to my colleague, Avri, to comment from her side on the ATRT3.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. First, very much appreciate ATRT, and I think of it as sort of the queen of all the reviews. And it is the lynchpin of the bottom-up oversight of the organization. So very much treat its recommendations as something very important.

EN

At the same time, from the OEC, the organizational effectiveness, is looking at—which is an oversight and a very strange nature of being oversight over a bottom-up process. So there really is a whole set of dynamics there that we do need to look at.

I wanted to mention that several of the things that are recommended have already been started. For example, the WS2 implementation is something that was a priority for this year and is a priority for next year. So that was basically a decision that it did not need to wait for further prioritization in effect because it was the tail end of the transition and was needed even before ATRT could tell us that it was needed. It was something that was there, and therefore that's being worked on.

In terms of many of the transparency issues that are listed, even though they're listed as lower in your priority list, where those things can be done without great extra expense, without great projects being put, those things are starting to drift in and we'll have to track them and keep track of them.

In terms of ATRT, certainly the notion of prioritization which was already a concern but certainly those recommendations have been prioritized and are being used and looked into as part of figuring out how to prioritize our way through the backlog that we have. So in terms of have we started, in many ways, we have, even though we formally say that until it's prioritized, the work doesn't begin. Much of it is already in progress.

EN

In terms of the holistic review, one of the reasons it needed to be a pilot is the relationship between writing a bylaw that understands what a holistic review is and how it works and the degree to which all of the SOs and ACs who are bottom up have basically accepted it is indeed— because again, a review does not impose necessarily on a bottom-up structure. They need to agree to it, they need to come along willingly and looking at that.

You're certainly right, in terms of the whole self-review, I think, yes, if an SO or an AC has the bandwidth to start thinking about that, that's wonderful and they can then feed into the OEC's work as it moves forward.

The other part about the holistic review is the bylaws that support future iterations of that really needs to come out of that. And for that to be an effective review, we believe that there needs to be a terms of reference that are very specific, because if one looks at the holistic review, it's a very large hole. And it is not something that I believe—and this is a personal statement—can be done in 12 months, 18 months or even two years, unless there is an agreed upon terms of reference among the SOs and ACs that must participate in it.

So assuming that the holistic review will rise to the top of the prioritization review—and it is already being talked about, but actually getting into the actual work of it, assuming that it reaches the rest, then we need to drive for the terms of reference that the various SOs and ACs can buy into and can participate in gainfully.

I think that was the last point, and I'm sure that I've used my time in any case. So thank you. I pass it back.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Now it's time for Xavier Calvez, please. thank you very much.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Sébastien and thank you, everyone, for the opportunity to speak. As a matter of context to this conversation about the ATRT3 recommendation on reviews, many of you know that there are approximately 240, 250 recommendations that are the subject of implementation work at various different phases of it. Avri has already spoken about the fact that there's a lot of work going on across many of those recommendations, whether they are at the planning stage or they are already in the actual implementation part of the work.

That's part of the context. Of course, among those 250 recommendations, there are the ATRT3 recommendations. Separately, second element of context, the organization has initiated last year a project to develop a prioritization framework. And Avri just spoke about that topic a little bit to indicate that there are of course these 250 recommendations, but there's also other implementation work that the organization is dealing with, the policy implementation work.

All that work is a volume of work that community organizations participate to, that the Board participates to, and of course, the Org participates to in support. That work needs to be organized and

prioritized. And the Org has initiated this project to help develop a framework to prioritize that work based on community input of prioritization. And Avri was illustrating the point earlier that once we have this prioritization framework put in place, which we intend to do in the month of January through March coming up, so in a couple months, we intend to carry out a pilot of that prioritization framework about all the implementation work of ICANN but focusing this pilot on the reviews recommendations, and that pilot would therefore enable to have a community based input to establish an order of priority for the implementation work of reviews.

Should the recommendation from ATRT3 about changing reviews be prioritized through that mechanism, that then gives the green light for all of us to work together to design the process of creating this holistic review pilot, for example, to start also designing how continuous improvement could work, how the specific reviews evolve, so that that holistic review pilot can be designed and then carried out.

You can see that there's a sequence of steps here that need to be carried out, and that the alignment and participation of the community organizations into this process will be very critical to let that happen. So with that, I'll stop here. I think I'm at the end of the time, and I hope this was helpful, separate insight. THANK you, Avri, for initiating that conversation. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Steve, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Sébastien. Steve DelBianco, I'm the policy chair of the Business Constituency, which is part of the Commercial Stakeholders Group along with the Intellectual Property Constituency and the Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers. Some background on why CSG has concerns with some of the ATRT3 recommendations and why we are left hoping that the holistic review could really be useful.

I'll start in July of 2009, and as a result of the bylaws required GNSO organizational review, the ICANN Board imposed a restructuring to change the balance and GNSO. They replaced the weighted voting with the two-house structure and combined our three constituencies under the umbrella of the CSG. It lowered the CSG votes and raised the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group to parity in the Noncontracted Parties House.

This decision was not welcomed by CSG constituencies, but our hope was that maybe a new nonprofit constituency could emerge in the NCSG that shared our concern to keep users and registrants safe from fraud and abuse that might have balanced the privacy focus of NCSG at the time. Well, that hasn't happened yet. So CSG faced a diminished role in the GNSO.

Fast forward to 2009. US government's joint project agreement with ICANN was expiring and many in the community wanted the US government to extend its oversight to hold ICANN accountable. But the

Obama administration wanted the US to diminish its role. So the US government replaced the JPA with the affirmation of commitments.

It's a bilateral agreement between ICANN and the US government which was cancelable by either party at any time. But think about this, the AOC created the four specific reviews we've been talking about today, ATRT, RDS, SSR and CCT. That gave CSG members some real optimism that maybe these specific reviews could force improvements that would not get through the unbalanced GNSO. And the first iteration of the affirmation reviews justified our optimism, although some recommendations are still pending implementation today.

Well, then in 2014, the US government announced it would relinquish its last contractual link to ICANN, the IANA contract. Now NTIA handed the community the opportunity to leverage the IANA transition in order to strengthen accountability in ICANN bylaws. As part of 200 meetings, 12,000 e-mails, 40 stress tests and 200 participants on the CCWG put out a final proposal in 2016 to help our empowered community make ICANN answerable to more than just itself.

Now most important in that discussion, we imported the AOC specific reviews into the ICANN bylaws, especially because the AOC was bilateral and could be cancelled at any time. Along the way, we increased the time between specific reviews to five years, we created a process to appoint review team members from every AC and So, and we established ICANN's commitments as part of the bylaws for those reviews. In Work Stream 2, I worked with Cheryl Langdon-Orr in order

to create additional accountability mechanisms, including SO/AC accountability practices.

That brings us to now. Experience says that now the CSG doubts that the PDPs can impose new obligations on the contract parties or that Org will vigorously enforce contracts. So these specific reviews are more essential than ever. And that's why last year they CSG said that it was inadequate justification to scale back the organizational and specific reviews or to postpone SSR and RDS.

As far as the holistic review, we believe the holistic review should complement, not replace an existing review. There's too much risk of non-transparency and confusion if a single holistic review every seven years replaces organizational and specific reviews. We do believe this is a good time to examine the holistic structure of the GNSO and ICANN in general and try to make the structure fair and less subject to capture and veto by contracted parties. And I now give the Floor to Hadia Elminiawi of AFRALO.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Steve. This is Hadia Elminiawi, currently AFRALO NomCom delegate. First and foremost, holistic reviews require participation and support from the entire community. And especially that this upcoming review is just a pilot project but following this, it would be required to be incorporated in in the bylaws. And that definitely requires community support.

There's one thing here. I'm not sure about prioritization, and I'm not sure that it is correct or right to conflate policy department working and implementation with work related to accountability and review processes. I'm not sure that it is okay to fit those two into the same queue to have work related to policy development and implementation put in the same queue with work related to accountability and transparency processes.

So whichever way we go—so now we decided on the holistic review. So we should start it as soon as possible, because we need to have accountability and we need to have some sort of reviews, right? And the reasons we need to go ahead as soon as possible is because of the impact of the holistic review on ICANN's mission, commitment and core value values, also the impact of it on the community performance and effectiveness.

And then let's also remember that the ATRT4 will start two years after the holistic review. So if we postpone the holistic review, we are also postponing the ATRT if we decided to go down this road, then we are also postponing the ATRT4 and then postponing that would lead also to a postponing the look into the assessment report coming out of the improved programs of the SOs and ACs.

So, my point is if the community agrees on the holistic reviews, then we should start as soon as possible. I don't think it's appropriate to put it in the same queue and line with other pending policy implementations. As we mentioned, terms of reference. So, so I guess the next step, we should look into how much the community actually supports these

EN

holistic reviews. And then the community should start drafting those terms of reference.

And then the other thought here, if we are actually to postpone the—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You are over, Hadia. You need to give the floor to the next one. I'm sorry.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Sorry. I'll stop. Thank you so much.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible] take the floor. Thank you very much.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Hi. This is Jaap Akkerhuis speaking and I'm from the SSAC. I'm an SSAC member since the beginning [inaudible] ccNSO committees on the subject of country codes since I'm member of the ISO 3166.

But back to the SSAC comments. After our comments, we haven't really changed anything what we said there. So let me just go and repeat what we said there.

SSAC is worried about generic stuff saying that they can be combined into one, and that seems to be an awful lot of reviews. SSAC [inaudible] overload as well in staff as in volunteers for doing all these reviews. So

the potential recommendation should be carefully assessed for absolute necessity, practicality and cost and effect. These are the things, so that's a more generic comment.

The other one, some more specific comment is what really disturbs SSAC is the large disparity between ICANN's self-assessments of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendation and the assessments of the review team. There seems to be quite a difference in what has been done with the previous review and the result of that. So kind of worried about what's going to happen with the recommendations of ATRT3 as well in spite of this same problem.

With respect to the prioritization framework and processes to that, the alignment of the strategic plan, one of the recommendations is that it should be a community process, but in reality, it's yet another process and I think it's better to move this to the SO and AC leadership facilitating this process. I think we're running out of time very quickly.

So the last point I wanted to mention is that SSAC actually sees a lot of merit in combining the various reviews, mostly because some seem to be quite and overlap, and also to minimize the overload and possibly burnout of volunteers and staff.

So let's go to the next speaker, and if I'm correct, that's Eduardo Diaz from NARALO.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much. This is Eduardo, chair of NARALO. This holistic review for me is like uncharted waters in the sense that I don't remember seeing something like this before. So I'm very interested in seeing what will come out of it, because what we have been doing before, going from organization to organization and doing specific reviews, seems to me like we have been in reviews all the time. You finish one, you start the other one.

So I also agree with having this pilot for this holistic review, because like I said before, we are in uncharted waters and we don't want to create this monster, we want to really understand what it is and I agree with Avri that we have to refine it and have some terms of reference to help us direct and narrow down the scope so the holistic review doesn't take ten years to do and by the end, we are not here, somebody else would be here.

So I definitely support this. I think it will help the organization understand each other as to why do we exist and what is our role within the policy development process from the advisory part, and from the service organizational part. And also, I think from going through this holistic review, we as an organization will understand not only where we fit in this whole process but understand, like I said before, what are we supposed to be doing while we are here, while we do have these constituencies and service organization, how do we interact. So I think I look forward to this and I think this would be a very good improvement, something very good is going to happen from this going forward in terms of the work that we all do together as a community. Thank you. The next person is Bruna Santos—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Eduardo. As Bruna is not with us, we will give the floor to Hervé Clément from the ASO. Hervé, please go ahead.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT: Thank you very much. So I'm a little surprised to be there so quick. I am the vice chair of the ASO AC. The ASO is composed of two chapters: the ASO AC, so 15 people from the different communities of the Internet, and the NRO EC composed of the CEOs of the regional Internet registries.

So it's a little different and we are very specific within the ASO, because the policies are not developed via an ICANN process but within the different communities, the five communities of the regions with very specific roles from region to region.

So this review we are talking today won't be focused on this specific policy development, etc. There is one exception. There is the global policies. What is a global policy? A global policy is a policy common to the five regions and deals with the IANA functions as well, and there is an ICANN process with the Board, with the ASO AC, etc. to deal with that. So we say that all the community has to be impacted by this review we are talking about today. So I will say that for 90% of the policies of the ASO, no, but there is still this 10% that are impacted.

And of course, the ASO is a supporting organization, so there are links with the ICANN with the appointment of two ICANN Board directors,

with nomination of a representative for the NomCom of the ICANN, and our role is also to give advice to the Board on addressing issues as well.

So I don't think we are the most impacted SO by this accountability and transparency review, but we have still some [inaudible] to be careful to that. Knowing that, also, we have specific review conducted by independent organization. For instance, in 2017, it was the second independent review of the ASO with 18 recommendations, and one of those was the adoption of the SO MoU to reflect the reality of the empowered community.

So thank you very much for your attention. Now I will give the floor to Harold Arcos from LACRALO.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much. My name is Harold Arcos, I am the secretary for the Latin America and Caribbean At-Large Organization, and I'm going to finish my term at the end of this meeting.

So in our consultation with the different members, we all agree that we have to comply with the reviews that are established and set forth by the ICANN bylaws, and at the same time, we agree that this holistic review is necessary and we are well aware of all that this holistic review implies and the processes that should be undertaken in order to materialize this review.

Of course, we do agree with the fact that it is important to have this pilot program so as to be a sort of experiment. And believe this is

EN

important, to have this first approach to this experience. There are two key stakeholders. One was mentioned by Steve DelBianco. One of these factors is the issue of transparency, and all these new processes that we're looking for within ICANN. And on the other hand, when it comes to the organizational culture, this is something that we already know, this is not new, but we need to take into account. This is important in a global organization as it is the case of ICANN.

So it is important to take into account the volunteers. So we are always the same participants and of course, we are not part of a corporate staff and we are working on these processes, and of course, those of us who are volunteers, we love doing this but there is a reality that was mentioned before and we do agree with that. And this is that the time and the burnout of volunteers is something real.

So based on these two elements, we believe it is very important to have this holistic review, because we have had some experiences and we had an implementation process and of course, with the different hierarchies, but we can spend a whole fiscal year implementing a process and probably with an ongoing improvement process, everything would be better.

So in that way, I believe that we can have other mechanisms to improve the time and we are having emerging issues and emerging ways of using and spending our time, using the DNS, and on the other hand, we know that it is necessary for us to have these organizational improvement processes from the organizational point of view and from the police

EN

point of view. So now I'm going to give the floor to Samantha. Samantha, please go ahead.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Harold. This is Samantha Demetriou. I am the chair of the Registries Stakeholder Group. The RySG represents the interests of gTLD registry operators within ICANN. And along with the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we make up the Contracting Parties House of the GNSO.

So the Registries Stakeholder Group agrees that reviews in general are critical accountability mechanisms in ensuring ICANN transparency and accountability. But I think that over time, we have identified some of the same concerns that the ATRT3 team recognized in terms of the reviews as they were currently being conducted, as they were currently embodied, not quite being fit for purpose and not really achieving the aims they were set out to achieve.

Eduardo mentioned that first off, we sort of feel like we were in an endless cycle of constant reviews. We've also had concerns about a lot of the specific reviews that have been conducted recently. And it's something that Steve touched on, that a lot of these review teams were coming out with recommendations that should be in the purview of the policy development process.

We have a lot of concerns that a small review team should not be taking the place of the GNSO processes to develop policies, especially ones that impact our contracts directly. So we've been very active in in being

EN

trying to be involved in review teams where we can, but also following their work very closely and submitting comments on the output.

We've also took a keen interest in the papers that ICANN Org published over the course of 2018 and 2019 that were seeking to improve reviews overall. And they published documents on updating the operating standards that review teams would follow, as well as suggestions for improving the timelines on this. And on both of those, as well as in our comments on the ATRT3 final report and draft report, we've been very supportive of suggestions to streamline the review process and to accelerate the timeline or I should maybe say focus the timelines that review teams do their work under, but also in setting narrow and achievable scopes in these review that wouldn't necessarily stray into policy development and would allow the review teams to do their work more efficiently.

So we were definitely encouraged by those recommendations that came out of the ATRT3 final report. And while we weren't necessarily very vocal about the holistic review in our public comments on this report, we do I think generally support the objectives that the holistic review is trying to achieve. And I would like to underscore something Avri said, that the terms of reference need to be pretty focused, at least especially for this pilot as the community gets used to this new review to make sure that the work is being done effectively and is achieving the goals it sets out to achieve. So thanks very much for the time and next, I will turn the floor over to Roberto Gaetano of EURALO.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Hello. I'm Roberto Gaetano of the EURALO Board. Thanks for allowing EURALO to express its point of view during this third At-Large policy session and this flash pitch to gather the opinion of the various parts of the ICANN community regarding ICANN accountability and transparency and the ICANN reviews.

The EURALO is in line with all the ATRT recommendations. More specifically, EURALO considers the proposed holistic review very important. ICANN 2.0 was born 20 years ago and since then, the Board has never taken time to do a holistic review of the global organization.

Siloes and topical reviews were conducted, and the relation between the community and the Board evolved during the IANA stewardship transition. So it is time, before any other review, to start an ICANN holistic review to ask whether the current structure still best serves ICANN responsibilities or if changes are needed to better achieve ICANN's objectives. Also to ensure representation of community views and to be able to consider diversity of inputs and improve consensus building.

The Board changes this recommendation to a pilot. EURALO is okay with this next phase but considers that ICANN needs to keep the timeline as close as possible with the one proposed by ATRT3. And also, in terms of the budget, as this does not include the current ICANN budget, not to wait for the next budget cycle, EURALO suggests looking and using the supplemental fund for implementation of community recommendations to start as soon as possible a pilot for the ICANN holistic review addressing the issues identified by ATRT3.

And now I give the floor to Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Roberto. Hello everyone. This is Manal Ismail, chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN. Thanks to ALAC for inviting the GAC to this community discussion on ATRT3 recommendations regarding changes to specific and organizational reviews.

Given the GAC's limited resources and competing priorities, the GAC hasn't discussed the full set of ATRT recommendations and focused its discussion on GAC-related suggestions which we normally do following closely the GAC-related suggestions to enhance our working methods. The GAC not being part of ICANN's regular organizational reviews uses three mechanisms to improve its operations.

First, as mentioned earlier, through ATRT, GAC-related recommendations that take into consideration community input and provides the GAC with feedback on how the community sees the GAC and where the GAC needs to improve. Second, through the Board-GAC interaction group, BGIG, which as the name implies focuses on how to make the relationship between the GAC and the Board most effective and efficient. And third, through reviewing our own operating principles to ensure they accurately reflect agreed mechanisms and enhancements resulting from internal GAC deliberations but also ATRT recommendations and/or BGIG discussions.

Yet the GAC is aware of and interested in ATRT3 recommendations that are being discussed today. We understand their longer-term operational implications on the GAC and other SOs and ACs. And the devil is in the details, as we've heard earlier, so the GAC is willing to participate in collaborative community efforts, including a pilot on these community review and prioritization recommendations.

It looks like it's time for the community to work together on holistic reviews, prioritization, Work Stream 2 among other things. So in short, although the GAC did not start its discussion yet, we appreciate the invitation to contribute to this brainstorming and be guided by reviews of the rest of the community in our GAC discussion that are yet to follow. Thanks again, everyone, and allow me to hand over the floor to Philippe Fouquart, chair of ICANN's GNSO Council.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. Hi everyone. Hope you can hear me. Philippe Fouquart here with the GNSO. I will not reiterate what my colleauges have just said. There's a variety of views within the GNSO. I hope I'm going to do justice to what we have just said. You've heard about the CSG's expectations regarding the holistic review coming up with a more balanced expression of views within the GNSO, taking into account the broader landscape, including the external interfaces about organization.

Bruna from the NCSG was not with us. I'll just refer to a previous contribution on that topic expressing some concerns over the potential

EN

complexity of a holistic review. And Sam has just intervened regarding both the complexity of reviews of reviews and the burden for the community, the risk for review teams to overstep the PDP, the policy development process, but also generally a support for the holistic review.

So as I said, there's at this point some variety of views within the GNSO as far as the what is concerned, that holistic review, and to the how, the mechanics that we might be using. We put in place—we being the Council, the SGs and Cs as they expressed their views within Council put in place a Council committee on continuous improvement with an appalling acronym which I have to look up, the CCOICI, that's Council Committee of Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement, for which at this point, that committee doesn't have ATRT3 under their remit, but it's a pilot with a limited remit that was originally defined as something that might take that onboard and take various views within the GNSO and take that forward as our input. So that remains to be seen, but that is an option for us to consider. So with this, I'll just conclude and hand over to Maureen for APRALO. Thanks very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Maureen Hilyard from the ALAC. I'd just liked to first of all thank everyone for their contributions. I must admit that the community perspectives that have been presented have made it very difficult for me to add anything new.

What I would like to give as perhaps an At-Large community perspective, end user perspective, the At-Large community has spent a lot of time over the last few years on continuous improvement, which was a result of a reflection of our own processes following our own organizational review five or so years ago, and we certainly believe that ICANN itself would benefit from a similar review of its entire setup for the many reasons that have already been mentioned.

And in support of this, I must mention that during this period of great change as a result of the pandemic, the move towards a virtual environment has not been without some considerable inconvenience to the lives of many of our volunteers with regards to fitting ICANN between work and family.

But despite the inconvenience, as other people have mentioned, volunteers from all the ICANN communities have still spent thousands of hours of virtual interaction as they've carried out the work of ICANN, even without the benefit of the face-to-face meetings or other means of working with our ICANN colleagues.

There are current structures that are in place that were in place 20 years ago. Do they still best serve the interests of its various community components? This has been mentioned already, but are they fixable and agile enough to allow for regular updating and to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose, as Cheryl and others have mentioned?

From my perspective, I believe it to be very timely that ICANN initiates a similar time of reflection on its past 23 years of experience, and five of

EN

those being post-IANA transition, to look at how they might best set up both Org and the ICANN community for the next five to 25 years. On that note, I'll give the floor back to Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Maureen, and thank you, everybody. We are at the end of this session, and we will meet again in 20 minutes. It's a shorter break than it was planned. Please stay in this room as it will be the same one. And just closed your microphone and come back at half hour, whatever hour it is in your part of the world. And once again, thank you very much and see you soon.

I don't know if staff want to add things before we close this first part of the session. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Nothing to add. Thank you very much, Sébastien. See everyone in a little less than 20 minutes. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]