Pilot Holistic Review ToR Team Comments – 5 May Plenary Call

Comments during 5 May Plenary Call

Definitions
_____

<mark>Good practices: practices that have been shown to be effective in the past and have limited objection.</mark>

Sebastien: why we push to use a good practice and not best practice because it's what is at stake. I don't know if we need to spend too much of what it is good practice, if we have good best practice, I'm sure that we will not spend time on that. And, and the reason is that at least from my point of view, why we don't want to call best practices, because if it's a best practice, that means that it must be used by everybody or every groups. Here, we talk about good practice, that means it could be good for one group and a little bit different for the other, therefore it's not one size fits all, but we can use the practice of other to build our own on practice and therefore it's more diverse and it's more I guess sustainable at the end of the day. That's the way I was thinking when I push for the idea not to use best practice.

Vanda: What I see in this definition that lacks the common use for many groups and practices so for any kind of practice. So, because this definition is good but lacks that common sense around the same idea. So, I will add some compliments to this definition that is additionally of the common use of the industry, of the organization as well, whatever. But I believe lacks this common use, universal use, or best uses in the industry or something like that. So, that's what I said what I saw reading this definition. Also, that Sebastien has some points on here because best practice has different uses in other languages, even English.

Avri: I had taken my hand down because I thought Sebastian gave us a perfect explanation of why not use best practice, it is such an overloaded overused misunderstood term. I think it's fine to say in this definition, if we want, that we're using this in lieu of best practice because of the liabilities with the term best practice that we see everywhere. I don't know that we want to spend a lot of time wordsmithing, I think it's great that some of the people want to come back and attach some word suggestions and stuff to these. So, if that Vanda wants to come back, but I think we have to be somewhat careful not to limit it too much in trying to define it.

Matthew: do we have any "practices that have been shown to be effectives in the past" in ICANN?

Maarten: I think these are well expressed in the Operation Standards we adopted in 2019.

Maarten: If not … we may need to update the operating standards? (as the "standards" are "guidelines").

Matthew: then we should use those as a basis?

Cheryl: And I'm delighted Avri that I let you go first because you've just framed a whole bunch of what I was going to allude to. If I looked into the body of works, because I originally came from a standards background. Those of you who may not know, my company for some 20 odd years was one of the top QI and QA is companies in Australia, so I kind of know a little bit about standards. And best practices are things that are frequently referred to in that in that area. But there is so much variety and diversity in body of work there's a lot of academics, you know

dining out and making their career on the differences here and the nomenclature. So, you can find as many definitions, authoritative definitions, one way or the other. And I think what's important is for in an ICANN context and in terms of this work that we come up with the definition that works for us works, works for ICANN and is linked to the term, which I think should preferably be Good Practice. Yeah, it is a I've put some other words together that Jason's got, it just not reflected in this document that's fine. So, we can fiddle with those definitions, but let's not worry about which definition, let's just have a definition and one that works, specifically for ICANN and not necessarily from each and every industry point of view, because it just depends on what sector you're looking at as to how its defined in some cases in exactly opposite ways.

Matthew: you know, I think that the practices have been shown to be effective in the past and having limited objection. I'm just wondering if we don't have something that we can draw upon that's already existing in the lexicon of ICANN work and then Martin contributed a couple of thoughts in terms of what he suggested we could look at. Rather than looking elsewhere and recognizing the context within which we're working, it might just be worthwhile to draw on those if they are suitable.

Maarten: If I may add to that one thing, if we feel they're not perfect, and they never perfect, because they're good practice, practice guidelines, then we can always update. But it's good to have this body of knowledge very, very qualified experiences reflective and that saw how the operational standards were for setup. So, that's why I think it's useful vehicle.

Pat: Martin, I do agree with you on the on the operating standards that we used in 2019. But I think being one of the first groups to go through the operating standards in 2019 as we applied them to ATRT3, there's probably some refinements that would be necessary to even make it a best practice, but I do agree it's a good practice. But I think that we learned a lot in using it using during ATRT3.

Larisa: Not to belabor the point, but just to highlight that, I believe, where the term good practice is used in the stated objective by one of the components of the ATRT3 recommendations, it has a particular meaning. So, while a term of good practice could have broad implications for how the review team should operate in operating standards and such, but if I recall correctly, as it relates to how ATRT3 used that in the state of the objective, it alludes to practices, probably within the SOs and ACs for how they operate and how they do things. If I'm recalling correctly.

<mark>Survey:</mark>

Cheryl: To me in the ICANN context, what we should be looking at is something a lot looser than the far more professionalized and well designed for analysis survey, in the more fulsome use in in some of the sciences, but I did put a whole bunch of words here, including the soft stuff, which must make Avri in hysterics, like appraise. I didn't put one in there, which is data capture. I regret that because I suspect what some of what we're intending for the purposes of the Holistic Reviews or in cases of the ongoing continuous improvement baseline and then, how do we measure how we've improved type stuff that ATRT3 was talking about. What we really mean is data capture, it is simply what is happening to compare to what then can be improved. So, it is softer stuff, it's not the full survey as would make Avri and others happy, but I think we can find a term providing these clearly defined that makes it clear. Because an excellent robust survey is a costly and very specific thing to undertake, and I do not believe that was the intention.

Pilot Holistic Review ToR Team Comments – 5 May Plenary Call

Avri (CHAT): it would take us close to 18 months to define a proper survey following defined methods. we do not want to define one of those.

Cheryl (CHAT): more a data capture exercise than any form of full blown "survey". indeed @Avri and that was *not* the intent

Avri (CHAT): we want a survey monkey type survey at best.

Cheryl (CHAT): or even a document and practice desk review. a what are you doing exploration.

Avri (CHAT): I think we are defining it to cover people who are not part of the community. but who may read this.

Pat: So, given what you and Avri both just said, would it be better for us to just to define the survey, as opposed to a survey in that we would define what is expected of the survey that would be used as part of this process?

Vanda: I don't I don't believe we need to define because it's a common sense in our Community. But if it is for me to define, it's just received opinions on any issue from the Community, because it's dedicated to our communities is not a survey with statistics, and so what. So, it's something that we need to receive comments from what they think about what we are thinking. It's just that, so I do believe everyone in our Community understands the use of survey word in our context. So, for me, we should not define survey, it's just another word in English that everybody understands.

Pat: So, you use the word common sense, but I know that you know different groups are going to have a different understanding of that. I think from a Holistic Review standpoint in ATRT3, we talked about one of the tools that is to be used is a survey from the constituent groups, the parts, that would inform how well that group is serving their constituents. And so…

Vanda: So that's one issue for survey. What I'm saying that any time we try to define inside our Community, we do surveys for 1,000's of different issues. So, any issue can be an object of survey in our Community. That's why I believe we don't need to define exactly what a survey is, because we can use survey for any public comment comments, is a survey for our point of view.

Pat: Now, but I think you're I think you're absolutely correct from that standpoint, but I guess my point was that we're talking about a very specific survey as part of the Holistic recommendation. And maybe there's a possibility, and I'll leave it at here unless someone else wants to weigh in, but there might be a possibility here to identify what the expectation is for the Holistic Review team of the surveys being done by the constituent parts. And so we can we can think about that, over time, but that's kind of where my head's going right now. So, I didn't catch all the comments in chat, but Leon has made a comment to maybe say an opinion survey.

Cheryl: I'm not sure that's in keeping with the intent. It's not the opinions of what is, for example, going on, it is the what is going on. Because for continuous improvement or even to assess and analyze what needs to be improved, you need a baseline and we were very much talking about the what is happening in the AC/SOs, that's the data that needs to be established, collected in some way, call it what you will, so that then, improvements can be measured upon that, improvement programs can be designed around that. How much people like or dislike it comes into the analysis of that. Not necessarily the identification of what is going on, so let's not keep

what is going on and how much we like it or how much we feel it's effective, they're kind of slightly different things. They are part of a spectrum, but the survey term is right at the basics.

Larisa: I just posted in the chat that in the draft ToR we actually have a note of where the term survey came from, so perhaps in the definition section, we could just restate that the word survey shows up is as it relates to this survey is it was defined by ATRT3 or referenced by ATRT3.

Pat: That would be helpful. Thank you, Larisa.

Cheryl: Basically, this is another one of those delightful spaces where what one means in terms of a definition of continuous improvement, notice not program or process, because as soon as you use the two terms continuous improvement, you're really have a divergence between what is a continuous improvement program and what it's a continuous improvement process. So I was just saying, if you look at the work of the term of all various things meant by that, it includes a number of steps and it doesn't matter whether there's a whole bunch of them. Three step programs, seven step processes, nine steps, you know, pick a number, you can have that many steps. But they usually involve a set of identifications, a set of analysis, and then a set of implementables that then get planned and put into place. Then they ideally get tested for their effectiveness and efficiency before one either tweaks them or goes through the cycle, again.

Katrina: When we were reading through the terms of reference document, I could not understand the relation between good practices and continuous improvement and how, at least in my mind when I read where it was like trying to continuously improve best or good practices of SOs / ACs but then there was a very short comment from Cheryl which said that we're talking about good practices of continuous improvement, not continuous improvement of good practices. And my suggestion would be do not try to define good practice separately, because it might cause a misunderstanding. Maybe not everybody is so deep into the idea of Holistic Reviews. So talk about continuous improvement and good practices of continuous improvement, not just good practices by themselves.

Vanda: I put in the in the that the continuous improvement is also part of management excellence that I believe is also used in ICANN org. So, I do believe that there could be the first step to look at the management excellent program. That is in using many companies around and there is definition for many things so maybe even in .org there is a concept of management excellence that can be used as continuous improvement.

Sebastien: Just to react to Katrina, my feeling was if we write a definition it's not to be useful in one place in the document, and if we talk about good practice it's, not just for continuous improvement but it's also a good practice of sharing a meeting, with practice of writing a comment or writing a recommendation. Therefore, for the way we are writing it it's not to be linked with anything specifically. If we use it in this document for continuous improvement, so be it, but it's for a lot of other activities that it can be used to.

Pat: One thing that I would add here is that when I think about definitions that they can be ambiguous like this, I always try to think about what I'm trying to achieve. And it kind of made me think of it as a "such as" statement because I think when we think about continuous improvement, or at least when I think about continuous improvement in the ATRT3 context, it was such that we can we could bite off discrete pieces of work that weren't so huge and so voluminous that we ended up with 20 recommendations. It was a way to go through, and say how do you solve one problem, how do you solve the next problem, how do you solve the next

problem and be in continuous improvement mode around the processes but making certain that it was not continuous improvement on something the size of an elephant and more the size of a mouse in terms of discrete pieces of work. That's just how I think about continuous improvement. It really doesn't fit into a definition, but that's in my mind.

Cheryl (CHAT): but that is not directly applicable to ACS us.

Cheryl: That that that's in response to ISO 9000, and I made an awful lot of money over the years helping companies achieve that accreditation and it's really good at setting up auditable processes that does not necessarily go to any form of measurement or mechanism that is directly applicable for the success or otherwise of ACs and SOs. Rather just the data trail that one would be able to show what is or isn't, so you could build a really badly designed failing engineering bridge and still have it in terms of the paperwork, be auditable on 9001 to be accredited. There's a differentiation here, it's a rabbit hole, I know, but it's not just throw terms out and think that that somehow makes stuff better they help make stuff better, but they don't make it better in and of themselves.

Maarten: I think that is that's exactly the reason why we may want to refer to it and explain, because people know this is there, and some people are very happy that they got the certificate for their processes. Why that there's no foolproof seeking and I think what you just said, illustrates exactly why this could help explain what we mean. We mean not doing all the steps according to ISO 9001 we mean doing meaningful steps of continuous improvement.

Socialization:

Cheryl: This one is I think more commonly used and understood within an ICANN context, it has become a more of a common use term in with regard to taking a product of a process, be it a piece of policy or advice or whatever, and then having some form of interaction with Community be that a small part of the ICANN Community or the ICANN community as a whole to interact with the Community and seek some form or feedback on that material. And that's how my head defines it, at least, but just on the off chance that it is not as clearly understood by everybody that's kind of what it is in practice, we probably should try and make some sort of terms that can be used as a as a definition, you know document that's all.

Jason: I think this is two things, this is definitely a definition as to what is meant but it's also when it's included in the deliverables, what does this team think that means and what's going to be expected of the Holistic Review team.

Pat: For the second part of that, we are talking presentation, webinars… Yes/no team?

Avri: Yes, all the normal stuff.

Jason: I've read through a lot of the comments, and I know one question that came up is: is a webinar enough? So, I'd just like to introduce that back into the discussion as well.

Pat: Well, I guess it depends upon how often we have face to faces because webinar may be the only option from a certain standpoint. So, hopefully we still meet in June face to face, and we can start to have conversations that way, but certainly we ought to find a way to have an option, or even a requirement as long as we're face to face to be conducted to conduct a

session at or within the confines of an ICANN meeting. I think that would be helpful for regular planning.

Larisa: I think there was another component to this that the group discussed early on, which is the level of formality of webinars. Regardless of the face-to-face meetings, we could still have webinars and zoom rooms, virtual gatherings, but is that enough as compared to the more formal and perhaps somewhat more traditional means of getting Community input that comes to public comment proceeding.

Sebastien: I think in the in the roadmap, there is a different time with different activities when with the comment period and one with socialization with SO and AC and with the board. For me socialization starts by, and it will be also for comment period, but sharing the document and explaining it and discussing it, whatever the way we do it. Is it because we call some people, it is because we organize a webinar or because we organize a face to face meeting in one place of this world, all that could be socialization. And then it could be done by one of us, sorry by one of the members of the Review Team and could be done by all the Review Team. Therefore, it's quite open, from my point of view.

Matthew (CHAT): But socialization should be done in consistent and widely accessible ways - not ad hoc

Cheryl (CHAT): definitely @Mathew and expectations need to also be set.

<mark>Consensus:</mark>

Avri: on consensus, and even on public comment, I think on those we may be able to start with some of the stuff that's already defined in the documents of Cross Community Working Group methods and previous reviews and the operating standards, etc. So, you probably already have lots of material on those that we should kind of root it in and perhaps even base it on.

Pat: I think that's right, Avri. I've got a yes from Cheryl on that as well.

Maarten: So just be aware that you will not get one answer if you seek, and it's worthwhile seeking, and then on an informed basis come with a proposal, what is the best meaning in this context.

Avri: But some of them have already been defined in places, I mean in writing. Like in documents. So, yeah what from those may be helpful, as opposed to doing a survey, to find out what our notion of consensus or public comment is.

Cheryl: To follow on that, and Maarten's right. There's no way, we would, for example have all of ICANN agree to get very specific definition of what is consensus because they have a very specific definition of what is consensus. But to Avri's point, the Cross Community Working Groups, which I think are an excellent benchmark have adopted in the past very specific, and indeed, based on the GNSO PDP processes, the sets of definitions of not only consensus, but levels of consensus. So, we do have a body of work of other cross Community activities where yes, not everyone will be happy, but there you go. Because there's extraordinary challenges to get absolute unanimity as a measure of consensus in a multi stakeholder environment, so we should go with as every proposed what has worked in the past, dare I say, the good practices.

Pilot Holistic Review ToR Team Comments – 5 May Plenary Call

Pat: Alright, so we'll put it we'll get a starting point for consensus from something that's already being used and will work from there. The same for public comment I would assume.