

Pilot Holistic Review Update



Agenda

1. Origins - Pilot Holistic Review (PHR) mandate comes as implementation work of ATRT3
2. Challenges – scope of work, contradictory assumptions underpinning work, letter Chris and I sent to the board
3. Open questions/next steps

Origins: ATRT3 Recommendation

Recommendation 3.6: A new Holistic Review of ICANN shall be set up.

Objectives:

- Review **continuous improvement efforts of SO/AC/NC** based on good practices.
- Review the **effectiveness of the various inter-SO/AC/NC collaboration mechanisms**.
- Review the **accountability of SO/ACs or constituent parts to their members and constituencies** (this will include an in-depth analysis of the survey results).
- Review **SO/AC/NC as a whole to determine if they continue to have a purpose in the ICANN structure as they are currently constituted or if any changes in structures and operations are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as ensure optimal representation of community views** (but taking into consideration any impacts on the Board or the Empowered Community).

Origins: Board approval

The ICANN Board approved ATRT3's recommendation for a Holistic Review in November 2020 with the caveat that ([resolution](#), [scorecard](#)) the **first Holistic Review be conducted as a pilot to address information gaps, and operated pursuant to community-agreed Terms of Reference (ToR) and relevant elements of the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews.**

Challenges: PHR scope of work

According to the [PHR Terms of Reference](#), the main objectives of the PHR are:

1. meet the requirements defined in the [ATRT3 Final Report](#) and develop methodologies and guidelines for future Holistic Reviews to ensure they yield the outcomes intended by the ATRT3, and
2. address the gaps identified by the Board.

Challenges: contradictory assumptions underpinning work

Based on PHR Team discussions, it is the team's understanding that the Holistic Review is supposed to do two distinct things:

1. Review SOs, ACs, and NC in respect to effectiveness, accountability, and the interface between each of them. This review work is driven by the CIP work of each of the SOs, ACs, and NC.
2. Review the structure of the SOs, ACs, and NC individually and as a whole, essentially reviewing ICANN's structure. This would allow the reviewers to recommend new SOs or ACs be introduced and existing SOs and ACs be restructured.

Challenges: PHR Co-Chair Recommendations

1. Bifurcate the work to develop a Continuous Improvement Program (CIP) Review and a Structural Review.
2. Empower a CIP Review drafting team to work closely with the SO/AC/NC to ascertain their CIP methodologies and design a streamlined review of the CIP work.
3. Confirm that there is SO/AC/NC consensus in favour of creating a Specific Review on ICANN's structure.
4. Empower a Structural Review drafting team to design a Specific Review of the Structure of ICANN based upon Bylaws s4.6(a) and the Operating Standards.

