Comment (personal) in response to the current call for Public Comment on 'Streamlining Organisational Reviews'.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr
13 July, 2019.

Firstly, I appreciate the opportunity to hopefully contribute to the much required, in my view improvements in processes, design and methodology of the current ICANN Reviews process and specifically in this call for Public Comment the cycling of Organisational Reviews.

By way of background to my interests and direct experience in this field I would like to mention the following:-

Responses to the four specific questions that are the focus of this public comment:

1. Do you/your organization agree with the proposed list of issues that should form the focus of the streamlining process? If not, with which do you disagree and what would you like to add?

I do agree with the proposed list of issues and make the following specific comments regarding:

(i) Purpose and scope of organizational reviews;

I believe that the ICANN Community must agree on the purpose and scope of Organisational Reviews (and I would further propose consideration of a full redesign of the nature of the Reviews Program to permit a continuous improvement plan inclusive of a pattern of more regular, shorter, smaller highly focussed ínternal reviews/audits/ examinations; less frequent wider ranging or ICANN Holistic Review and occasional External or Independent Examination/audit/review methodologies being deployed).

One aspect of a more specific or focussed scope of Organisational Reviews would be as we move from the second round into subsequent ones, is a detailed analysis of the effectiveness, success in meeting objectives or aims etc of all the implemented actions in response to earlier recommendations from previous Reviews, noting here that there is often little or in some cases *no time* elapsed between final implementation or any implementation of some Review Recommendation responses before a following Review cycle begins… Also, suitably discreet or focussed scope or purpose of the next Reviews will assist in resourcing and time management demands associated with them, regardless of how they are structured.

(ii) Limited pool of suitable independent examiners, and selection of independent examiners;

I recognise the issue relating to the small size of the pool of suitable and available external or independent examiners available, but suggest that this should not be a negative factor in a redesigned process where less frequent and often more holistic ICANN.org reviews conducted by External subject matter experts, and more frequent and regularised continuous improvement programs and associated review/audits are conducted more frequently.

I would also note that a likely consequence of more frequent internal review processes will be the in service training of a larger pool of individuals with the appropriate experience, that if able to professionally distance themselves to establish appropriate independence, could extend the options of suitable examiners to be available in the pool in the future.

(iii) Whether or not recommendations issued by independent examiner should be binding or non-binding;

The current review process allows for the entity under review to respond to the independent examiner's findings and recommendations. I wholeheartedly support the right of the examined entity to establish the acceptability or otherwise of any reaction to an observation or Recommendation to action.

The ability for an inhouse feasibility assessment, prioritisation and costed implementation plan is an important step in an effective and organisationally efficient process for a number of reasons, including but not limited to; responsible and situationally specific resource management, as well as significant learning and organisational governance and process evolution that is facilitated by the thinking and analysis /discussion associated with the development of such Feasibility and Implementation planning.

(iv) Length of the entire review process including implementation;
This is where I see the desirability of not only the smaller changes proposed in this paper regarding the Issues and guided by the principles as important tools to remedy this 'problem' but that a more extensive review and possible rebuild/restructure of a program by the Community and in the light of both recent organisational changes and evolutions, as well as yet to be implemented recommendations from previous Reviews and the Cross Community Activities under the Work Stream 2 banner, as both timely and opportunity at this unique point in time. The rationale for this is outlined elsewhere in this response under section 2 below.

2. Do you/your organization agree with the proposed underlying principles that should guide the solutions? If not, with which do you disagree and what would you like to add?
I do agree with the proposed underlying principles, but would further suggest that with an appropriate hiatus in the current cycling of Organisational Reviews and resourcing of a well defined and strictly but reasonably time bound, cross community activity, to explore and debate this matter (and that of ICANN Reviews in general, so Specific and Organisational) with a scope that should include some óut of the box thinking, on how the desirable objectives of the current ICANN Reviews program can be better and more efficiently achieved.

This could be conducted in the light of ICANN's changes over the last few years as well as in a way that would promote more of a Continuous Improvement /Quality Systems approach with greater focus on less extensive targeted and regular internal procedures (audit, review or via Oversight activity work) along with less frequent overarching approaches, which allows for more holistic, realistically resourced and meshed programs of recommendation implementation and improvements and then occasional (with a longer but regularized timing for external or independently review/audit/assessment/reporting activities) being carried out in a manner that is predictable in terms of an expectation of 'every X years or no longer than X+ years since the last report', etc., or 'as triggered by a Y event such as 'Concern of the Community endorsed for action by the Empowered Community / Board' etc.

That can then start to build on opportunities for staged implementation processes, changing prioritisation of issues and needs analysis, other internal or external factors unpredicted at the tie of the previous review etc., The timing for this to happen now is both opportune and advantageous not just because of the OEC and Boards current focus on the matter but also because of the current engagement with the community work going on within the Evolution of ICANN Governance project and because there is convened and active an ATRT, which can of course make analysis, and recommendations (including as

to if there is a need to terminate or modify any periodic review under Sec 4.6 of the ICANN Bylaws) regarding Reviews.

3. Do you/your organization agree with the community role in the streamlining process? If not, what would you propose?

I do indeed agree with the proposed role of Community, Board and in particular ICANN.org, however in the discussion paper it was noted that, "the list of issues and guiding principles, as well as the role of the community and the high-level timeline, are not finalized",

I am assuming therefore and am sincerely hoping that, the input from community to this call for comments as well as some additional interactions during meetings and webinars for example is intended to fully engage and be a minimum of interaction that will aid if not specifically direct what really should be more 'community lead' development of recommendations and action relating to the issues and to make any required refinements to what I personally see as the already quite suitable guiding principles of 'Accountability, Timing, Consistency and the use of Industry-wide best practices' in our Reviews.

I believe, and I am confident the Community would better support a strong, transparent and inclusive engagement of the widest possible nature, with the full ICANN Community in the 'bottom up' development of this desirable 'next step' in the continuous improvement of ICANNs Organisational Reviews processes.

I therefore strongly support the proposal in the paper that states that "...*the role of the community in the streamlining process of organizational reviews is to provide substantial input and agree on possible solutions for the issues that require improvements. Whenever possible, final improvements need to be based on the broadest possible community consensus.*"

In my view this is as absolutely essential, not only under the "not about us - without us" principle but also to draw upon the very specific experiences and expertise. This is of course reflected in the paper with the following statement *"... The individual experiences of each Supporting Organization (SO) and Advisory Committee (AC), as well as the Nominating Committee (NomCom) regarding the organizational review process all differ. For a successful outcome of the streamlining process, all community views should be heard and considered equally and with an open mind.''*

This of course will allow us to build on, amongst other things, the experiences that the community has had in the last two iterations of Organisational Reviews can bring to the success and acceptance of the outcomes of the process;

It is also well noted that the role of the ICANN Board to be *" … responsible for alignment of the streamlining process with the intent and the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws and with the strategic direction and priorities of ICANN as a whole…"*; Noting of course that the Board is in itself a part of the wider ICANN Community and could also engage with full community based activities directly as well.

4. Do you/your organization agree with the proposed high-level timeline? If not, what would you propose?

On this matter, whilst I see and understand the rationale for the proposed timeline, and I do not disagree that is would be workable, I Strongly encourage ICANN to follow the option outlined in the paper *"...In accordance with community input,7 the next round of reviews should not start until this streamlining process is completed. Therefore, if more time is needed the ICANN Board will work with the SO/ACs to ensure that the next round of organizational reviews does not start until this streamlining process is completed, or an alternative solution is found."* and so clearly prefer that at this time while ICANN has so much opportunity for effective changes to be made in an efficient yet still community driven way, that a 'hard break' or moratorium is declared to allow such work to be fully explored without the additional pressure of what is actually a highly artificial, and it could be argued even unnecessary time cycle pressure.

If this approach was taken however the scope of such work, a strict but sufficient project duration and suitable resourcing to achieve the work plan to be executed would need to be well designed and provided for.

I recognise that some parts of the Community will perhaps wish to slavishly continue under the existing cycle timing as it is ïn the bylaws" and whilst there may seem to be a pressure from the current time in our cycle of reviews (with the 5 year clock being started again with the iminent acceptance of the final report of reviewed component parts of the ICANN Organisation in the cycle of Organisational Reviews by the ICANN Board) I believe that a strong and convincing argument could and should be made now to take a moratorium on further Organisation Reviews until the current reviews of these and other reviews is predominantly completed with full engagement with the ICANN Community.

Finally regarding the proposed '4 Step Process' proposed in the paper, as presented this seems a reasonable design for an inclusive process, and should the wisdom of a more fulsome review of Reviews by the Community be seen and agreed to would need only minor variation to be used in such a large review and redesign process requirement

I again appreciate my comments on this matter being considered, stand willing to assist in any way in the next steps and am of course available to ICANN.org should you wish to reach out to me post public Comment Review to respond to any clarifying questions etc.,

Kindest regards

Cheryl Langdon-Orr
langdonorr (at) gmail.com
+61 408647214; +61 2 96521047