AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews

Introduction

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC Liaison to the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) and Holly Raiche, ALAC member of the Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO) and ALAC Leadership Team member composed an initial draft of the ALAC Statement.

On 25 June 2015, the first draft of the Statement was posted on the At-Large Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews Workspace.

On 06 July 2015, Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC, requested ICANN Policy Staff in support of the ALAC to send a Call for Comments on the Statement to all At-Large members via the ALAC-Announce Mailing List.

On 09 July 2015, a version incorporating the comments received was posted on the aforementioned workspace and the Chair requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote on the proposed Statement from 10 July 2015 to 15 July 2015.

The Chair then requested that a Statement be transmitted to the ICANN public comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this topic, with a note that the Statement is pending ALAC ratification.

On 16 July 2015, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 13 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. You may view the result independently under: https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=4906TKJ97C6mUXVfIH4pBfHs.

Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews

Public Comment Input Template <snipped to include ALAC / At-Large Comments predominantly>

The purpose of the Public Comment posting is to request community feedback on a proposed schedule and process, including operational improvements, for Reviews mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC Reviews) and the ICANN Bylaws (Organizational Reviews). The request for the community is based on both appreciating the community's workload and the timing of several Reviews in FY2016.

The following template has been developed to facilitate input to this Public Comment. Use of the template is encouraged, but not required. This template provides the opportunity for general input on the proposal as well as specific comments by section. Please note that there is no obligation to complete all of the sections – commenters may respond to as many or as few as they wish.

Following completion of the template, please save the document and submit it as an attachment to the Public Comment proceeding: comments-proposed-aoc-org-reviews-process-15may15@icann.org

A. Please provide your name:
   Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr (pen holders for ALAC Public Comment on this matter, please see https://community.icann.org/x/-440Aw)

B. Please provide your affiliation:
   At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

C. Are you providing input on behalf of another entity (e.g. organization, company, government)?
   No

D. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question, please list the entity on whose behalf you are submitting these comments:
   NOTE: This is a comment provided on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and at the time of final drafting is still subject to full ALAC ratification.

Please add your comments into the designated areas within the following document.

Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews

[The information below is the same as that contained in the **Public Comment posting** and is included in this document for your convenience.]

BRIEF OVERVIEW

Purpose
<snip>

DETAILED INFORMATION

Section I: Description, Explanation, and Purpose
<snip>

Section II: Background and Proposal

BACKGROUND – AOC REVIEWS
<snip>

BACKGRGOUND – ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEWS
<snip>

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

1. Three AoC Reviews and initial work on the At-Large Review are proposed for FY2016, and three Organizational Reviews would be deferred until FY2017. Timing for the Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust Review is not impacted by this proposal. The proposed schedule for AoC Reviews strives to clarify the starting point for the next cycle of Reviews, includes sufficient time for planning and organizing of Reviews, and reflects a more focused Review scope (discussed below). This public consultation recognizes that the CCWG on Accountability is considering incorporating the AoC Reviews into the ICANN Bylaws, and any output of the CCWG Accountability recommendations will be factored into this timeline, if the immediate set of Reviews is affected. For Organizational Reviews, the NomCom2, RSSAC2 and SSAC2 Reviews would be deferred for one year, until FY2017.

AoC Reviews –
<snip>

COMMENT: Please provide your comments on the proposed AoC Review schedule, under which three AoC Reviews would be conducted concurrently.

The ALAC and wider At-Large Community has been closely involved and engaged in all of the AoC reviews conducted to date, as well as instrumental in and integral to, the preparation and planning of upcoming critical reviews and processes via both previous ongoing activities in the post new gTLD Program Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCTCC) Review, as well as the current work and developing proposals relating to Review Teams and Organisational Reviews from within the Cross Community Working Group on ICANNs Accountability Mechanisms; so in general we are supportive of the planned program specifically where the CCTCC Review commencement unaffected, as it is critical in our view that this is consistent with the AoC requirements, but we would consider the possible extension of (or hiatus in) this planned process to ensure that the baseline data set collections which are required are fully available to the Review Team for the bulk of their allocated project work time line, and not being introduced to proceedings at the mid term or near end of their review time.

ALAC specifically requests that the ATRT3 Review Team be convened no later than January 2017 and that there be no undue delay in the other AoC mandated reviews whilst the work of the CCWG on Accountability continues through to the completion of its Work Stream 1 and into its Work Stream 2 phases. We would suggest however that serious consideration be given to staggering the commencement of the otherwise concurrent AoC Reviews by several months (to ensure that a minimum of at least 1 ICANN 'A' or 'C' Meeting is allowed to have as unique a focus as possible on each separate Review). This needs not to result in an extension beyond a 12-13 month period being dedicated to the Review phase of the SSR2 and WHOIS2 (nor the ATRT3) but rather result in a project management design that allows for 'overlap rather than specific 'concurrent' activities, noting that an option for a hiatus within the project timeline for the CCTCC would also need to be factored in as an alternative to extension beyond the designed 1 year review length, and that again an opportunity for community and public discussion at least 1 major face to face meeting of IANN is desirable if not essential, in our view.

Organizational Reviews –
<snip>

<u>**COMMENT: Please provide your comments on the proposed Organizational Review schedule, which calls for the At-Large2 Review to proceed based on a slower schedule and NomCom 2, RSSAC2 and SSAC2 to commence in FY2017.**</u>

The ALAC and wider At-Large Community, in general and the At-Large 2 Review and self assessment team in particular, deeply appreciate the modification to the internal Organisational Review Schedule outlined in this proposal/plan. Specifically comments collected in the ALAC Wiki page associated with this Public Comment, that were confined to the organisational review of At-Large, as called for Article IV, Section 4 of the Bylaws, focused as to whether ALAC / At-Large has a continuing purpose in the

ICANN structure and if so, whether any change in structure of operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness; noted that "given the very heavy demands that have been placed on the time of ALAC volunteers in responding to the transition of the stewardship of the IANA function to ICANN, the extension of time of this review is very welcome. The extended timeframe will allow a period for self-assessment of key ALAC players, as well as participation of all the RALOs in identifying questions that should be part of the review, and key individuals whose insights and experience will be critical to the review. It will also allow time to assess the effectiveness of recommendations coming out of At-Large."   Further it was also noted and "that input will provide a clearer framework in which an independent examiner can be selected."

There was in our discussions during the recent ICANN 53 Meeting in Buenos Aires general support for the planned commencement of the NomCom2, SSAC2 and RSSAC2 Reviews in 2017 to better allow for "lessons learned from both the GNSO2 and At-Large2 Reviews to be better integrated into the planning, processes and project management of these reviews. Also comment received in our outreach on this matter reflecting specifically to the delay in commencement of the At-Large Review2 "...we strongly support the elongation of the timetable in recognition of the other crucial demands upon the community." would be we believe quite widely held as relevant to all or the Organisational 2 Reviews.

Some concerns about the proposed [extended] timetable were raised by leaders within the ALAC; "... about the timetable:
- The volunteers performing the review are not necessarily the same people involved in IANA Stewardship Transition and/or ICANN Accountability
- The perspective of asking for another Board Director is pushed further back
- According to the information supplied, the last ALAC review started with an RFP in 2007 and concluded in 2010/2011, by far the longest review cycle of all of the ICANN reviews. (4 years?) The new schedule shows 3 years - shorter…"

However we note that within the well socialized 'new plans and design for organisational reviews' over the last few years it has been consistently presented to the wider ICANN Community that these reviews would operate over a 5 year cycle that includes both the Review process itself as well as Implementation, and review of effectiveness of changes made/ implemented as a result of proposed organisational changes and continuous improvement, so that the last bullet point above, is perhaps more of an observation that the new program requires at least this 5 year cycle approach, rather than outlining further or new concerns produced by these proposed modifications to timetable.

Finally it should be noted that as the 1st ALAC/At-Large Review specifically and necessarily limited itself primarily to the review of the ALAC in its review of the fitness for purpose, effectiveness and continuing purpose of ALAC /At-Large in the ICANN

structure, as the tri-layered ALAC⇔ RALO ⇔ ALS construct was still relatively new in 2007 whereby the RFP went out, with the last of the 5 geographically distinct RALOs only put into place that year, and the first in 2006, this second organisational review will be the first opportunity to review the RALO and At-Large Structures, and that it is now timely to more extensively review.

PROPOSED PROCESS/OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

2. Use planning and project management tools for AoC Reviews, including clear and focused Review scope, consistent budgeting, and cost tracking.
<snip>

COMMENT: Please provide your comments on the proposal to apply planning and project management tools to Reviews.

The ALAC and At-Large Community, as stated previously has been an integral and highly engaged part of the ICANN wider Community's contributions to AoC reviews to date, inclusive of both ATRT1 and 2 and therefore, welcomes the proactive approach proposed for the use of "...planning and project management tools for AOC Reviews, including clear and focused Review scope, consistent budgeting, and cost tracking." Assuming that this will result in the stated aims of clear focus and scoping, improved planning and budgeting of both time and funds, as well as resource allocation; consistency and some standardisation of the processes; as well as aspects of 'continuous improvements including the creation of templates, checklists and sample plans. Further we note with appreciation, the keenness of staff engaged in these review projects, to collaborate with and learn from the experiences and opinion of our community members with skill sets and experience relevant to these matters as well as specifically involved in previous ICANN Review processes, both AoC and Organisational.

3. Streamline AoC Review teams and Review duration.
<snip>

COMMENT: Please provide your comments on the proposal to streamline AoC Review teams and Review durations.

The ALAC and At-Large Community based upon their experiences as contributors and engaged community in AoC Reviews undertaken to date, support the proposal to modify the "terms of service for the Review teams, so they can answer questions about the intent and implementation of their recommendations." This is we believe a required 'flexibility' and will be (we also believe) consistent with the likely outcomes from the CCWG on ICANN Accountabilities work in this area as well.

4. Focus each Organizational Review on operational effectiveness and include self-assessments and focused preparatory actions by the organization under Review.
<snip>

COMMENT: Please provide your comments on the proposal to focus each Organizational Review on operational effectiveness and include self-assessments and focused preparatory actions by the organization under review.

The ALAC and At-Large Community, particularly based upon the very different experiences of our 1st ALAC/At-Large Review and that currently being undertaken (albeit now slowed down) being currently in its initial planning, development and self assessment phases; is as previously stated, in full support of efforts to undertake a continuous improvement program, relating to Organisational (and indeed AoC) Reviews. Therefor we have no hesitation in supporting these proposed mechanisms that should allow for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Review operations, methodologies and processes.

5. Consider establishing an alternate process (to Organizational Reviews) to examine strategic issues such as the continued purpose of organizations.
<snip>

COMMENT: Please provide your comments on the proposal to focus Organizational Reviews on operational effectiveness consider establishing an alternate to examine strategic issues such as the continued purpose of organizations.

The ALAC is supportive of continuation of Organisational Reviews which continue to effectively and efficiently explore the continuing fitness for purpose of our entities 'component parts' (AC/SO's), and will be interested to engage and contribute to these ongoing reviews of both our own AC and that of others, as we have in the 1st round of Organisational reviews and the recent GNSO2 process. However we do believe that with so many 'moving parts' at this time, and little opportunity to consolidate outcomes and review recent changes to these review processes, (as well as noting the current and no doubt ongoing work on Accountability not only for ICANN in general bit for the AC's and SO's in particular, being conducted or planned within the CCWG on ICANN Accountability, and the CWG on IANA Functions and Stewardship Transition) it may be too soon to immediately or in the near term (within this next cycle of Reviews #2) implement or undertake alternative processes, noting of course that exploration and planning of such alternative(s) could and perhaps should indeed be explored with the ICANN Community and stakeholders during this time.

Further we would also agree with other commenter in this PC process who have suggested that it may indeed be timely and appropriate to undertake a wider ICANN' structure and function' Review.

IMPROVEMENTS UNDERWAY – For your information
<snip>

Other Comments

<u>Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise for the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews?</u>

The ALAC would like to suggest that the closer collaboration and effective interaction between the staff tasked with management of these Review processes (in particularly the Organisational Reviews, could be taken a pilot project to encourage (if not require) better and more frequent interaction between the SIC and the various AC's and SO's subject to these review processes as well as encourage this Board committee and the ICANN Board as a whole to become more engaged and proactive with the Community in future AoC Review processes and the outcomes for Reviews resulting from the current work on improving ICANN's Accountability, with an aim of a 'partnership model' being entrenched in an effective and efficient program of continuous improvement for the organisation as a whole as well as relating to its component parts.

Section III: Document and Resource Links