Developing a Framework for SO/AC Reviews

Presenter: Rob Hoggarth
Why A New Framework?

- Process Efficiency & Consistency
- Transparency & Fairness
- Objectivity ...where possible

Organizational Effectiveness
Organizational Review Cycle

- Review: 16 Months
- Implement: 18 Months
- New TOR: 4 Months
- Assess: 8 Months
- Operations: 30 Months

5 Year Cycle Start
# Review Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Macro</th>
<th>Micro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Review Committee</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 m</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Primarily Interviews</td>
<td>Primarily Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>Org Response</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Develop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Operations**: 30 Months
- **Assess**: 8 Months
- **New TOR**: 4 Months
- **Implement**: 18 Months
- **Review**: 16 Months

---

**5 Year Cycle Start**
Organizational Review Process

Five Year Cycle-Complete

MACRO
**Qualitative** Review: Community Team

MICRO
**Quantitative** Review: External Consultant

Contract & Team Selection

Conduct Review

Response & Comment

Plan & Implement

Operations

Assess

Revise Criteria
A Two Pronged Approach

Macro Elements Qualitative
- Mission Fulfillment
- Continuing Purpose
- Structural Viability
- Environmental Responsiveness

Micro Elements Quantitative
- Adherence to Charter & ICANN Principles
- Governance & Management
- Membership Processes
- Elections & Voting
- Communications & Participation
Macro Elements: Qualitative

- Mission Fulfillment
- Continuing Purpose
- Structural Viability
- Environmental Responsiveness
Section 1: Purpose (Evaluative Questions)

• Has the SO been effective in achieving its principle mission as defined in its Charter or Bylaws?
• Are there any internal/external factors that have contributed to or inhibited the achievement of SO's mission?
• Have the SO's initiatives remained consonant with its mission and purpose?
• Does the SO have a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure?
• Does the mission/purpose of this SO need to be revised or amended in any way that would enhance its effectiveness within ICANN?
• Has the SO been effective in achieving its key objectives/goals during the review period?
Macro Criteria-GNSO (§2)

Section 2: Structure (Evaluative Questions)

• Is the SO organized in a way that supports and contributes to the achievement of its mission/purpose?

• Are there any recommended structural/design changes or adaptations that would enhance the effectiveness of the SO in achieving its purpose?

• Does the SO have the appropriate quantity and type of resources (human and financial capital) needed to accomplish its mission?

• Are there any structural impediments affecting the SO from achieving its mission/purpose?

Macro Assessment

The Community Team should provide a brief summary statement as to the effectiveness of the organization's Purpose/Structure as a result of having explored the evaluative questions. Recommendations should be documented along with supporting rationale.
Micro Elements: Quantitative

Organizational Groups

- Adherence to Charter & ICANN Principles
- Governance & Management
- Membership Processes
- Elections & Voting
- Communications & Participation
Started With GNSO...
Criteria for SG/Cs

Operational Components

- 1.0 Charter
- 2.0 Structure and Organization
- 3.0 Leadership and Management
- 4.0 Membership
- 5.0 Communications
- 6.0 Elections and Voting
- 7.0 Finance, Accounting, and Records
- 8.0 Participation and Engagement

Each one separately evaluated according to specific criteria...

We have prepared an example from this component
# Objectivity

## Point-Based Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>81-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning:</td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next: How it could be applied...
## Example

### From Section 5.0 Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the organization publish a calendar containing events with dates/times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Open (i.e., not Closed) leadership meetings to Total &gt; 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based upon a random sample of organization meetings and teleconferences held within the past 12 months:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Notifications to invitees were sent out at least 7 days in advance &gt; 90% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>- A record of the meetings (e.g., summary, key decisions, action items) was published within 14 days &gt; 90% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the organization have a web or wiki presence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>A record of all meetings (see above definition) is made available on the organization's web or wiki site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the organization maintain an archived public e-mail distribution list?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ICANN Principles (Tag): F=Fairness; O=Openness; R=Representativeness; T=Transparency; and A=Accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Applicable Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Ys</th>
<th>Percent (Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Assessment?

**Option 1**
- Average (*) 8 component scores to yield single overall composite rating

**Option 2**
- No total score, but require an action plan for any individual component rating < 4.0

(*) Could also be a weighted average
GNSO Review Plan Framework

Rob Hoggarth and Ken Bour (Consultant) are working on a project for Ray Plzak (Chair-Structural Improvements Committee) to put together an organizational review framework, including the specification of objective criteria, that can be used to evaluate the (a) continuing purpose and (b) effectiveness of the GNSO as an ICANN Supporting Organization.

One possible structure that we are entertaining is outlined below:

GNSO Review Framework

1. Overall SO Effectiveness
   - Develop a series of broad and largely qualitative criteria related to overall purpose, function, and effectiveness of the Supporting Organization examining its mission, structure, inputs, and outputs.

2. Frame a series of largely quantitative criteria targeted at evaluating the effectiveness of processes within each of the GNSO’s major components:
   - a. Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies (Draft Completed)
   - b. GNSO Council (Not Started)
   - c. Working Groups and Teams (Not Started)

In terms of approach, Ray would like to structure the process such that it might begin with an organizational self-assessment that would be subsequently reviewed at successively higher levels, where applicable, followed by an independent reviewer.

Work-in-Progress at this Wiki link:
https://community.icann.org/display/GNSO/GNSO+Review+Plan+Framework