

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

We thank ICANN for the opportunity to provide input into this critical piece of work that the community will be dealing with over the next number of years.

Cyber Invasion is a security and risk management consultancy based in Dublin, Ireland. We are active community members within ICANN focusing on Privacy and operational concerns related to non-profits and at-risk individuals.

Please note that this comment is made in a personal capacity on behalf of Cyber Invasion Ltd..

Existing workload:

Given the high intensity with which the community is addressing the IANA Stewardship transition and the other policy development and advisory activities which are ongoing throughout the community we would have overarching concerns about volunteer burnout, a smaller pool of potential candidates due to the existing workload and the additional strain which will undoubtedly come along with the reviews.

SSR2, WHOIS2,CCT

These three reviews are critical to enabling ICANN to address the changes and development in these areas that have happened in recent times. The outputs that will be produced by these review teams will be at the core of ICANNs work in a post transition world and as such are coming at a critical phase in ICANNs evolution. We note this interrelation for a critical reason, many of those who are working on the IANA stewardship will also wish to have the ability to provide substantial and constructive input and work into these reviews.

We believe that many communities may encounter substantial issues in recruiting for and maintaining the high standard of volunteers that is required in order to have these reviews proceed both to schedule and to produce the extremely high quality output that is necessary to guide ICANN into the future. With volunteers already tied up both in the work of existing PDPs and the work of the IANA Stewardship many people will be in the position of juggling their existing responsibilities and taking on new ones under the reviews. This will result in volunteer exhaustion and also eventually in burnout.

We would suggest that in conjunction with our below suggestion on employing the services of a program manager to develop a more balanced schedule.

ALAC2, GNSO2,NomCom2,SSAC2,RSSAC2

Given the more internal nature of these reviews we would be supportive of the proposed timeline and schedule. However are comments are from the point of view of our participation in

the GNSO which is coming to a conclusion on its own review period. The impact onto the other communities may be greater and require further consideration.

We would cautiously note that deference to the availability of staff must be made when scheduling these reorganisation reviews as overburdening of staff may have follow on impact on other areas of ICANN.

Program Management

We applaud ICANN for adopting the PMI standards for project management with regards to these review. We believe that working within this well tested framework will provide important structure to the management and execution of these reviews.

We would like to make a constructive suggestion as to the management of the overall reviews program. With a number of concurrent reviews taking place, with a complex overlap of community resources and time required we feel that there may be a need to employ the services of a strong program manager to guide both ICANN and the community through this critical time.

We appreciate the strong project management experience that exists within ICANN however this request would be specifically to look at program management services which is a related but different discipline, guiding the interrelation between the various projects and advising on the complex scheduling and resource management challenges.

We would also appreciate that the management of these three reviews may not constitute a full time workload for such a program manager. We feel that if this resource was deployed into a community facing program management resource the the value of this role could extend beyond the reviews schedule. The resource would become a value add for both ICANN and the community and could assist in reducing volunteer burnout and add to the effectiveness of the communities participation in ICANN.

The PgMP Role Delineation used by the PMI states that program managers are delineated from project manager in the following manner:

Under minimal supervision, program managers are responsible and accountable for the coordinated management of multiple, related projects directed toward strategic business and organizational objectives. These programs contain complex activities that may span functions, organizations, geographic regions and cultures. Program managers build credibility, establish rapport and maintain communication with stakeholders at multiple levels, including those external to the organization. Program managers define and initiate projects and assign project managers to manage cost, schedule and performance of component projects, while working to ensure the ultimate success and acceptance of the program.

Program managers maintain continuous alignment of program scope with strategic business objectives, and make recommendations to modify the program to enhance effectiveness toward the business result or strategic intent. Program managers are responsible for determining and coordinating the sharing of resources among their constituent projects to the overall benefit of the program. Program managers possess the knowledge and skills needed to be effective in the project, business and/or government environments, and to make decisions that accomplish strategic objectives. In addition, the program manager should have advanced skills in finance, cross cultural awareness, leadership, communication, influence, negotiation and conflict resolution.

The relationship among portfolios, programs, and projects is such that a portfolio refers to a collection of projects, programs, sub portfolios, and operations managed as a group to achieve strategic objectives. Programs are grouped within a portfolio and are comprised of subprograms, projects, or other work that are managed in a coordinated fashion in support of the portfolio. Individual projects that are either within or outside of a program are still considered part of a portfolio. Although the projects or programs within the portfolio may not necessarily be interdependent or directly related, they are linked to the organization's strategic plan by means of the organization's portfolio. We feel that the AoC reviews, the Organisational reviews and a number of other high interest topics would benefit from being managed in a controlled manner with strong input from the community in their management. A program manager tasked with working alongside the community in a collaborative manner would be a valuable resource addition to the ICANN PMO team.

Program management focuses on the project interdependencies and helps to determine the optimal approach for managing them. If we apply these interdependencies to the AoC and operational reviews we believe that the review process may be executed in a efficient and manageable manner. Actions related to these interdependencies may include:

- Analysing staff and community resource constraints and/or conflicts that affect multiple projects within the program,
- Aligning organizational/strategic direction that affects project and program goals and objectives, and
- Resolving issues and change management within a shared governance structure, recognising the community led nature of these projects.

We believe that working in conjunction with ICANN we can come to an acceptable solution and approach to the multitude of reviews and related work that is approaching and hope that the principles of a fact based, balanced approach to the concerns of the community will be adopted.

On behalf of Cyber Invasion Ltd

- James Gannon - Policy and Security Practise Lead.