

# Report of Public Comments

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews</b>																
<b>Publication Date:</b>	13 July 2015																
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Larisa Gurnick																
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Comment Period:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comment Open Date:</td> <td>15 May 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comment Close Date:</td> <td>8 July 2015</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Comment Period:</b>		Comment Open Date:	15 May 2015	Comment Close Date:	8 July 2015	<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><b>Important Information Links</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Announcement</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Public Comment Box</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">View Comments Submitted</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Important Information Links</b>		Announcement		Public Comment Box		View Comments Submitted	
<b>Comment Period:</b>																	
Comment Open Date:	15 May 2015																
Comment Close Date:	8 July 2015																
<b>Important Information Links</b>																	
Announcement																	
Public Comment Box																	
View Comments Submitted																	
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Larisa Gurnick	<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:Larisa.gurnick@icann.org">Larisa.gurnick@icann.org</a>														
<b>Section I: General Overview and Next Steps</b>																	
<p>While there was general agreement and concern about volunteer workload and the community's and ICANN's ability to conduct the unusually large number of Reviews, there was not a consensus on how to resolve this situation specific to AoC Reviews. The views ranged -- from maintaining the AoC Review schedule as is and preparing to conduct ATRT3 starting in January 2016, effectively resulting in four AoC Reviews running simultaneously -- to deferring the AoC Reviews until approval of the new Bylaws which will be related to these Reviews as a result of the work currently underway within CCWG-Accountability. Outlined below are suggestions and rationale offered by the public.</p> <p>There was general agreement with the proposed schedule for the Organizational Reviews as well as general support for the outlined process improvements. The project management discipline resonated with many commenters, with several suggesting that a Review Program Manager would be beneficial in helping ICANN and the community to work through the challenges of multiple reviews. Although one commenter disagreed with any ICANN staff work that would affect the content of the reviews or of the milestones or streamlining that would not be subject to change by the review team once it is constituted, most were supportive of the proposed improvements to streamline Reviews. The topic of implementation of Review recommendations was flagged as an important element of ICANN's accountability, with several suggestions for improvements from the public.</p> <p>The Board will consider the Proposed Review Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements at their July 2015 meeting, taking into account public views and feedback. ICANN responses to the public comments will be added shortly to the below table SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS BY TOPIC.</p>																	
<b>Section II: Contributors</b>																	
<p><i>At the time this report was prepared, a total of [number] (n) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.</i></p>																	
<b>Organizations and Groups:</b>																	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>		<b>Initials</b>														
Cyber Invasion Ltd	James Gannon		JG														

GNSO Review Working Party	Jen Wolfe	JW
GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC)	Steven Metalitz	SM
International Trademark Association (INTA)	Lori Schulman	LS
Westlake Governance Limited	Richard Westlake	RW
Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	Rafik Dammak	RD
ALAC (ratified)	Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr	ALAC

**Individuals:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation (if provided)</b>	<b>Initials</b>
Edward Morris	GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	EM
Mathieu Weill	Via CCWG-Accountability	MW
Avri Doria	Via CCWG-Accountability	AD
Carlos Raul Gutierrez	Via CCWG-Accountability	CRG
Jonathan Zuck	Via CCWG-Accountability	JZ
Greg Shatan	Via CCWG-Accountability	GS

**Oral comments submitted during the [public session](#) on AoC and Organizational Reviews at ICANN53 on 24 June**

Alan Greenberg		AG
Avri Doria		AD
Chuck Gomes		CG
Fiona Asonga	Kenyan Exchange Point and a former member of ATRT2, currently with CCWG-Accountability	FA
Holly Raiche		HR
Jonathan Zuck		JZ
Mark McFadden	InterConnect Communications	MM
Matogoro Jabhera (via remote hub from Tanzania)		MJ
Richard Westlake	Westlake Governance	RW

**Section III: Summary of Comments**

*General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).*

Written comments were submitted by 7 organizations/groups and 6 individuals, 5 of whom participate in the CCWG-Accountability work but responded on their individual behalf. In addition, 9 individuals commented during the [public session](#) on AoC and Organizational Reviews held on 24 June at ICANN53, 3 of whom had also submitted written comments. Commenters represented stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO, the At-Large community as well as a global not-for-profit association with more than 6,400 member organizations from over 190 countries, a security and risk management consultancy, and a globally-focused governance consultancy.

## Section IV: Analysis of Comments

*General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

### **AoC Review Schedule**

While there was general agreement and concern about volunteer workload and the community's and ICANN's ability to conduct the unusually large number of Reviews, there was not a consensus on how to resolve this situation. The views ranged – from maintaining the AoC Review schedule as is and preparing to conduct ATRT3 starting in January 2016, effectively resulting in four AoC Reviews running simultaneously – to deferring the AoC Reviews until approval of the new Bylaws which will be related to these Reviews as a result of the work currently underway within CCWG-Accountability.

Commenters offered various options for modifying the AoC Review schedule:

- Maintain the AoC Review schedule as is and prepare to conduct ATRT3 starting in January 2016.
- Start the Reviews as scheduled, but extend the timeframe by six months to lessen the burden on the community.
- Push off the review of the new gTLD program along with the start of the new round.
- Seek agreement from AoC partner to postpone several reviews.
- Stagger the reviews.
- Employ the services of a program manager to develop a more balanced schedule.
- Defer all the AoC Reviews until approval of the new Bylaws which will be related to these Reviews.

Supporters of maintaining the current review schedule provided several reasons – the critical nature of ATRT3 Review, particularly to the work of CCWG-Accountability and to implementation of prior Review recommendations - “Not only do we need to find out what is happening with the ATRT2 recommendations, and the still pending ATRT1 recommendations, we need to set a baseline for the transition....There is not only a necessity to make sure that the Staff has correctly interpreted the recommendations, but to ensure that the changes are being made.” They further highlighted the importance of fulfilling the commitment under the AoC and cautioned that Reviews at ICANN are always a moving target, suggesting that the transition work currently underway should not deter the conduct of scheduled Reviews. One commenter “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.”

Commenters that advocated for a modification to the AoC Review schedule argued that the Reviews should not be thought of “...as impetus for implementation... We need to figure out some other mechanism to maintain momentum that isn't a full blown review. Some kind of IAG...” Several options were presented – see “Streamline AoC Review Teams and Review Duration”.

Coining the term “Reviewmageddon,” one commenter cited “...the risk of volunteer burnout, staff burnout, inattention to issues, suboptimal work product, and increased breakdowns outside the

Reviewmageddon in a community already taxed by IANA/Accountability...” and the “Interplay between Accountability Work and AoC Reviews: The AoC reviews will be reviewing a moving target, as the work of the CWG and CCWG changes ICANN.” The commenter concluded that “increased focus on a multiplicity of reviews will drain participants and support from the CCWG-Accountability.”

Several commenters offered various options for staggering the AoC Reviews in order to lessen the burden on the community and to focus on each Review. One noted that the “...opportunity for community and public discussion at least 1 major face to face meeting of ICANN is desirable if not essential...” “We would suggest ...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).” Another offered to stagger “the start dates of each of the AoC reviews and that the reviews occur every three years for at least two full cycles.” Another proposed solution was “In order to avoid the repeat of such a collision, the start of reviews should be staggered. Re: WHOIS2, SSR2 and CCT: As an initial starting point, suggest that we stagger the timelines, e.g. by 12 months” - (CCT, SSR2 and then WHOIS2). One commenter suggested a deferral of CCT Review on the basis of data gathering - “While arguments could be made for a short deferral of the start of each of the planned AoC reviews, we believe the arguments are especially compelling with regard to the Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust (CCT) review of the new gTLD program. ICANN has embarked on an ambitious data gathering program to support this review, and under the proposed schedule at least some and perhaps much of that data will not realistically be available to the CCT review team until well after that review gets underway.”

In connection with the WHOIS Review, several commenters noted extensive work underway, advocating for a delay in the start of the Review to allow for the work to develop further. “...we note that more than a dozen separate work streams are underway on various aspects of registration data services (including the current Whois), and that the impending implementation of the RDAP protocol may bring with it other disruptions to the status quo. It seems prudent therefore to consider some delay in launching the Whois 2 AoC review, so that these work streams (and the RDAP roll-out) may mature (and perhaps even conclude in some cases)...”

Several commenters expressed their views that modifying the Organizational Review schedule alone does not offer sufficient relief to the community. They noted that AoC Reviews are more complex, requiring cross-constituency interactions and more time, suggesting that AoC Reviews are of higher priority.

### **Organizational Review Schedule**

There was wide-spread support for the proposed Organizational Review schedule. Commenters recommended that the Bylaws be revised to “...provide more flexibility to deal with the workload issues” reminding that postponement of Organizational Reviews requires Board action and modification of the Bylaws.

A number of commenters addressed the review cycle and the time needed to conduct an effective Review. One commenter noted “Of the five-year review cycle, three years is likely to be spent on conducting the review and implementing improvements. The remaining two years may not be long enough for actual experience from significant changes.” Several underscored that Organizational Reviews rely on participation and work of volunteers, who appear to have a massive load on them, recommending “...that the Board take on board all the comments about the workload, about the

prioritization. We'd encourage both the people who are putting together the terms of reference...and the organizations themselves to build in time to participate in these reviews," and recommending that "...additional time be built into future reviews, to allow in particular for adequate consideration of draft findings and the first draft report." Commenters shared the view that Organizational Reviews are an important part of ICANN's continuous improvement and accountability process and the timeline for conducting each Review should consider workloads and provide sufficient time to do the Reviews well. Commenters used the current GNSO Review as an example, citing that additional time given to the GNSO Review via several extensions allowed for a better outcome and end result. They also expressed support for community involvement in the Review process via the Review Working Party mechanism. "Qualified, experienced and knowledgeable community members willing to dedicate focused and significant effort are an essential component of this important accountability mechanism functioning effectively."

Several commenters noted that "...deference to availability of staff must be made when scheduling these reviews as overburdening of staff may have follow on impact on other areas of ICANN."

Several commenters expressed appreciation to the Board for slowing down the Organizational Review schedule, noting that "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."

In addition to general agreement with the proposed Organizational Review schedule, one commenter specifically expressed "...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 AtLarge2 Reviews to be better integrated into the planning, processes and project management of these reviews."

### **Use Planning and Project Management Tools for AoC Reviews**

#### **Streamline AoC Review Teams and Review Duration**

Most commenters expressed general agreement and were encouraged by the adoption of PMI standards for project management. One commenter stated that "While we can agree to project management by the ICANN staff, we cannot agree with any ICANN staff work that would affect the content of the reviews or of the milestones. We also cannot agree to any streamlining that would not be subject to change by the review team once it is constituted." Another commenter agreed with the need to develop a clear and focused Review scope during the planning phase and recommended that most Review meetings be held virtually, eliminating travel time and expense.

Several commenters recommended that engaging a program manager would be beneficial to guide both ICANN and the community through the critical review process and the interrelation between various projects and advise on the complex scheduling and resource management challenges. "We feel that if this resource were deployed into a community-facing program management structure, time could be spent liaising with the community to ensure that while the projects run efficiently they all take community priorities into account. The value of this role could also extend beyond the reviews' schedules and would become valuable for both ICANN and the community, reducing volunteer burnout, adding to the effectiveness of the community's participation in ICANN, and contributing to the overall goals of effectiveness, trust, and accountability."

Another commenter reflected on “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.”

Several commenters offered words of caution – “there is a real danger that in doing so the community will cede effective control over the Reviews to staff and indeed to the process itself” and “it is paramount to streamline AoC Review terms and durations whenever possible and without unduly rushing the process...”

On the topic of the Review Team remaining active until implementation planning is complete, several commenters expressed support for forming an Implementation Advisory-style group. “We strongly support the idea the review teams can constitute the equivalent of an Implementation Review Team from amongst its members.” One commenter suggested that by forming an Implementation Advisory-style mechanism, the community would ensure more effective implementation of prior review recommendations. Additionally, one commenter suggested that this move would be consistent with the likely outcomes from the CCWG-Accountability work.

#### **Focus Organizational Reviews on Operational Effectiveness**

Commenters expressed general support for the self-assessment approach and community empowerment. One commenter expressed “full support of efforts to undertake a continuous improvement program, relating to Organisational (and indeed AoC) Reviews. Therefore we have no hesitation in supporting these proposed mechanisms that should allow for improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Review operations, methodologies and processes.” One commenter cautioned that “...any involvement by representatives of the organization under review should not replace or bias the work of the independent examiner. Otherwise, the integrity and independence of the review process could be comprised (or at least the implication of such could occur).”

Other commenters highlighted their concern about the exclusion of structural change from the current GNSO Review. “We urge that this conclusion with regard to “focus[ing] each organizational review on operational effectiveness,” to the exclusion of structural change issues, be reconsidered.” One commenter noted that “Among the changes needed in the organizational review is greater participation by the organization under review throughout the entire process of the review. This needs to begin with a return to the policy of an initial terms of reference for a review being done by the organization under review. It should also be clear that an organization that wished also to review its internal organization should be free to do so.” Still another commenter reflected on the extensive volunteer participation in the current GNSO Review process “As the GNSO Review Working Party, our group of 20 volunteers has put in significant energy and time to help make the GNSO Review and recommendations useful and supportive of continuous improvement - 17 meetings and two rounds of nearly 120 comments leading up to the Draft Report. The broader community also contributed to the GNSO Review in important ways by offering their views and feedback - 178 people completed online surveys and 40 people participated in one on one interviews.”

On the basis of their work as an independent examiner, one commenter suggested a process improvement “To develop a more relevant questions set for the 360, we believe that, in addition to questions developed by the Review Working Party, a limited number of interviews or small focus

group meetings should be conducted, by the Independent Examiner, before the questions for the 360 are finalized,” suggesting that this would ensure that views and issues of importance to “outsiders” would be reflected in the data gathering process.

### **Consider Establishing an Alternate Process (to Organizational Reviews) to Examine Strategic Issues**

There was general agreement with the proposal to establish an alternate process, with one commenter articulating that Organizational Reviews should focus on the “trees” while an alternate process should be developed to address the ICANN “forest.” One commenter advised that it may be too soon to implement such an alternate process, but agreed that the exploration within the ICANN community and the planning process could start in the near future.

Once commenter observed that the “The current review system results largely in an ICANN that is the sum of several well-reviewed parts, with no comprehensive examination of the whole.” It was further suggested that “Since ICANN’s operations have evolved significantly in the last decade, and usage of the Internet has also changed dramatically over that time, we would recommend that at some stage in the relatively near future (but, we would suggest, after the IANA Stewardship Transfer Project has concluded), such a review, which would incorporate ICANN as a whole with its component parts, might generate valuable strategic insights into how it might adapt to remain relevant and fit for its purpose over the next decade and beyond.” Several other commenters expressed general agreement with this idea.

### **Other Comments**

#### **Implementation of Review Recommendations**

Several commenters brought up the topic of Implementation of Review Recommendations. Several wanted to know the status of ATRT2 and ATRT1 recommendation implementation, suggesting that there should be publicly available dashboards of implementation status. Some asked for more clarity and detail on implementation. “Some of them right now are quite clear...Some of them are so opaque that one has to believe that either nothing is going on or you forgot to mention what it is.” One commenter stated that he was pleased to hear that the Board has reviewed the implementation work and suggested that it may be useful for the Board to have a dialogue with the Review Team members that produced the recommendations to see how they feel the implementation is progressing. Still another wanted to know more about the barriers to implementation, inquiring whether the issue was time or something else. Several commenters asked for more clarity on the status of ATRT1 recommendations.

Commenters were generally supportive of the idea of prioritizing recommendations, noting that future Review Teams would need timely information from staff at the end of the process when recommendations are finalized. Implementation comments related to Organizational Reviews as well, with one commenter specifically addressing the upcoming implementation phase of the GNSO2 Review, noting that quite a few of the 36 proposed recommendations may have significant cost implications and to the extent possible, the implementation should be aligned with the Budget cycle.

#### **Scope of Organizational Reviews**

Several commenters expressed their view that the organization under review and perhaps the broader community should have input into the scope of Organizational Reviews via a formal process (such as public comment). Several went further to suggest that the decision about the scope of the

Organizational Reviews should not be the Board's alone, with one commenter stating "...we would support changes in the bylaws assertion that the Board shall be the sole director of organizational reviews." One commenter invited the Board to consider what its role should be in reviewing a bottom-up self-organizing group, suggesting that determining the conditions of the review is incompatible with that bottom-up organization.

### **CCWG-Accountability**

Numerous commenters flagged the interrelationship between Reviews and the work of the CCWG-Accountability. As noted in above sections, some commenters felt that the Reviews should not be postponed, while others argued the opposite point. One commenter suggested that there should be more dialogue between the staff knowledgeable about the mechanics of the Review process and CCWG-Accountability, particularly when CCWG-Accountability in order to create synergy, save on time and save on effort.

One commenter reiterated its position set forth in its recent comment on the CCWG-Accountability proposal that the AoC in general should be incorporated into ICANN's bylaws.

### **Other**

- Gratitude was expressed to Jen Wolfe for her work as the Chair of the GNSO Review Working Group.
- "The community should be involved in the procurement and selection of the firms, if any, hired to provide guidance and advice in these Reviews. For those companies bidding on a contract who have previously worked in the ICANN community, comments should be solicited by staff from those parties affected by past reviews as to their view of past performance of the candidate firm."
- "...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 a 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."

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS BY TOPIC**

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
<b>1a – AoC Review Schedule</b>			
7	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Alan Greenberg	I'd like to thank the Board for its wisdom In deciding that we have to slow down this process and reconsider it. The original ATRT schedule said -- the AoC said every three years. We took that literally the first time. The first one was done in calendar year 2010. The second was done in calendar year 2013 with only two intermediate years. This time we're implicitly assuming there's three intermediate years. Otherwise we'd be starting another one next January.	
12	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Avri Doria (see also comment 30)	One of the things I'd like to caution is putting a dependency on starting the next ATRT on the work going on in the CCWG. The CCWG has yet to propose. The CCWG has yet to deal with the whole issue of how we phase out the AoC and bring in another regime of reviews. At this point we have a commitment to the AoC. At this point we have a recommendation from ATRT2 that the preparation work for the next ATRT, ATRT3 start at least three months before the turn of the year so that the review team actually gets a whole year. So, until such time as things change, I would really recommend that we maintain our commitment under the AoC to start that review on time and recommend, given that the Board did accept, at least in principle, all of the recommendations from ATRT2, that the preparations start in time for those teams to be seated by the beginning of January so that they can actually get going.	
18	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Chuck Gomes	Has there been consideration of the implications of the CEO being changed in the middle of a review that's going to be started?	Margie Milam, ICANN staff: The AoC says the CEO or its designee, so maybe we look at the designee to have continuity.  Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: That's why succession planning, which Fadi

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
			spent some time discussing yesterday, is so important.
20	<a href="#">Edward Morris</a> , GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	Agree with the proposal to start the AoC Reviews on time but would recommend extending the timeframe for the Reviews by six months to lessen the burden on the community. Accountability reviews should not be postponed due to the transition and related activities but certainly a small time extension to relieve the work burden on the community is reasonable and appropriate.	
26	<a href="#">James Gannon</a> , Cyber Invasion Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overarching concerns about volunteer burnout, a smaller pool of potential candidates due to the existing workload and the additional strain from the reviews.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>-Suggest employing the services of a program manager to develop a more balanced schedule.</li> </ul>	
29	Mathieu Weill, AFNIC ( <a href="#">via CCWG-Accountability</a> )	Stall the AoC reviews until approval of the new Bylaws which will be related to these reviews. Same for organizational reviews to avoid potential conflicting priorities with the SO/AC accountability discussion.	
30	Avri Doria (see also comment 12) ( <a href="#">via CCWG-Accountability</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Do not believe that stalling all, or perhaps any, of the reviews is a good idea.</li> <li>-Most important to the work of CCWG-Accountability, ATRT3 is scheduled for next year, though not even mentioned in the schedule. I believe it is critical that this review happen. Not only do we need to find out what is happening with the ATRT2 recommendations, and the still pending ATRT1</li> </ul>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>recommendations, we need to set a baseline for the transition. There is not only a necessity to make sure that the Staff has correctly interpreted the recommendations, but to ensure that the changes are being made.</p> <p>-Since the AOC reviews are based on an agreement, any decision for postponing any of them will need to be done with NTIA buy in.</p> <p>-Do not believe that avoiding current accountability mechanisms is a good tool for establishing stronger accountability.</p>	
31	Carlos Raul Gutierrez, ISOC Costa Rica Chapter ( <a href="#">via CCWG-Accountability</a> )	<p>Do not agree with stalling or stopping reviews. There are still recommendations of ATRT2 that have not been implemented. Stopping the AoC would be a very negative message if we are looking for a permanent culture of accountability.</p>	
32	Jonathan Zuck ( <a href="#">via CCWG-Accountability</a> )	<p>The challenge here is that there are 7 reviews scheduled for next year. The community simply doesn't have the bandwidth to do them all well. We don't suspend the notion of review because of our work but we DO need to think about volunteer burnout.</p> <p>- Reviews should not be the impetus for implementation. We need to figure out some other mechanism to maintain momentum that isn't a full blown review (i.e. IAG). Need to find a more precise mechanism for implementation monitoring and pressure.</p> <p>- Accountability is less about timing than about critical path. Can see pushing off reviews of the new gTLD program as long as we push off the start of a new round. Given the supply driven nature of this marketplace, the world can afford a delay and we can get it right instead of rushing.</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
33	Greg Shatan ( <a href="#">via CCWG-Accountability</a> )	<p>Potential "Reviewmageddon"*: An avalanche of reviews in 2015-2016.</p> <p>Factoring in AoC reviews, ATRT3 reviews, New gTLD Program reviews and the by-laws based organizational reviews, we have a review calendar that may constitute cruel and unusual punishment. This increases the risk of volunteer burnout, staff burnout, inattention to issues, suboptimal work product, and increased breakdowns outside the "Reviewmageddon" in a community already taxed by IANA/Accountability (and don't forget Work Stream 2!). Something needs to be done to relieve this situation. Merely pushing the organizational reviews back does not relieve that much of the pressure.</p> <p>- Interplay between Accountability Work and AoC Reviews: The AoC reviews will be reviewing a moving target, as the work of the CWG and CCWG changes ICANN. The AoC itself may disappear (subsumed in large part into the bylaws) before the AoC reviews are completed. New bylaws, processes and structures will make it difficult to review ICANN in midstream. This would need to be worked out with NTIA, not declared unilaterally.</p> <p>- Sense and share Mathieu's concern that increased focus on a multiplicity of reviews will drain participants and support from the CCWG-Accountability. While this may seem parochial, it is a well-founded concern.</p>	
35	<a href="#">Steven Metalitz</a> , IPC	<p>- Strongly agree that the current schedule to carry out 7 reviews during the upcoming fiscal year is totally unrealistic. The bandwidth of ICANN volunteers is already sorely overtaxed with the overlay of the IANA transition and ICANN accountability exercises on top of the reviews and all the other work streams underway within ICANN. - Skeptical that the staff's proposed solution will alleviate the problem. AoC reviews have far more cross-community implications than most of the organizational reviews.</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>- Propose that ICANN, through appropriate channels, seek agreement from its AoC partner to postpone at least one, and preferably two, of the AoC reviews by 6-9 months from the schedule presented. If deemed necessary, this change could be counterbalanced by accelerating some or all of the organizational reviews into FY 2016.</p> <p>- While arguments could be made for a short deferral of the start of each of the planned AoC reviews, we believe the arguments are especially compelling with regard to the CCT Review. ICANN has embarked on an ambitious data gathering program to support this review and under the proposed schedule at least some and perhaps much of that data will not realistically be available to the CCT review team until well after that review gets underway. IPC maintains the position that no future round should be launched until after the AoC review of the 2012 new gTLD round has been completed and the results of that review have been fully considered, including in a Policy Development Process.</p> <p>- Re: WHOIS2, we note that more than a dozen separate work streams are underway on various aspects of registration data services (including the current Whois), and that the impending implementation of the RDAP protocol may bring with it other disruptions to the status quo. It seems prudent to consider some delay in launching the WHOIS2 AoC review, so that these work streams (and the RDAP roll-out) may mature rather than all running in parallel.</p>	
37	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	Current schedule is not realistic or optimal. The large number of simultaneous reviews will have significant negative impacts on ICANN stakeholders' capacity, as well as ICANN resources. These reviews are too important to rush and the existing schedule will not allow sufficient time or resources. Question whether conducting the three AoC reviews, along with the	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>initial work on the At-Large Review, simultaneously during FY2016 will allow for full and engaged input from the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommend that ICANN consider the possibility of staggering the start dates of each of the AoC reviews and that the reviews occur every three years for at least two full cycles.</li> </ul>	
45	<p><a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a>, Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the high intensity with which the community is addressing the IANA Stewardship transition, the ICANN Accountability work and the other policy development and advisory activities, we have an overarching concern about impact of the workload. We are concerned about possible ensuing volunteer burnout, a smaller pool of potential candidates due to the existing workload, and the additional strain. We have serious concerns about the community's ability to execute this concurrent work plan.</li> <li>-The ATRT3 review must be carried out in 2016 as required by the AOC. The proposed schedule does not make sufficient reference to ATRT3 and leaves it out of the reviews that must be completed in 2016. Yet, with the first review ending Dec. 2010, and the second ending 2013, the third needs to be completed on Dec. 2016 in order to meet the requirement to complete a review no less frequently than every three years. Contrary to what has been written in the ICANN Background information, this requirement is not at all ambiguous. Planning for ATRT3 should begin in October 2015 so that ATRT3 can begin in January 2016. The fact that this review was not even mentioned in the timetable is very concerning.</li> <li>- All other AOC based reviews must be carried out according to AOC requirements.</li> <li>- Any deviations from the AOC schedule must have prior agreement of both the ICANN Community and of NTIA/DOC</li> <li>- Other reviews require Board action and preferably a bylaws change to be postponed. Suggest that we revise those bylaw</li> </ul>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>requirements to provide more flexibility to deal with the workload issues.</p> <p>-In order to avoid the repeat of such a collision, the start of reviews should be staggered. Re: WHOIS2, SSR2 and CCT: As an initial starting point, suggest that we stagger the timelines, e.g. by 12 months (CCT, SSR2 and then WHOIS2). SSR2 should take place post the IANA stewardship transition due to the impact that this period will have on the SSR2 review. WHOIS2 should follow after due to work currently underway (Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP and the IAG on WHOIS Conflicts on National Law and next generation domain name registration services) and WHOIS activities would benefit from the enhanced accountability structure and thinking we anticipate that ICANN will achieve after the IANA transition accountability activities are complete.</p> <p>-Implementation of the ATRT recommendations has been partial at best. We hope that their incorporation into the bylaws as a part of the IANA transition will ensure that they are given the attention and appropriate resourcing that is necessary.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>-Suggest employing the services of a program manager to develop a more balanced schedule.</p> <p>-Re: Organizational Reviews: Supportive of a changed timeline and schedule. We would cautiously note that deference to the availability of staff must be made when scheduling these reviews as overburdening of staff may have follow on impact on other areas of ICANN. We also believe that the bylaws should always be adhered to, until and unless they are altered using full ICANN bottom up processes for the sake of accountability.</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
50	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	<p>-In general supportive of the planned program specifically where the CCT Review commencement is unaffected.</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-Suggest 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 ICANN is desirable if not essential, in our view.</p>	
<b>1b – Organizational Review Schedule</b>			
6	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a>	Of the five-year review cycle, three years is likely to be spent on conducting the review and implementing improvements. The remaining two years may not be long enough for actual	Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: And, regards to that cycle, had five years to work with.

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
	Chuck Gomes	experience from significant changes.	
9	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Holly Raiche	I'd like to echo Alan's thanks to the delay of the review of the ALAC review, because everyone's time really has been taken up. At Large Review Working Party is developing criteria and determining areas that need to be addressed during the review.	
19	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Richard Westlake, Westlake Governance, independent examiner of the current GNSO Review	Our observation is that throughout these reviews the vast majority of the work has to be done by people who are not being paid to do it. The ICANN community is largely consisting of unpaid volunteers. They have limited time. Our impression is that they have a massive load on them. Recommend that the Board take on board all the comments about the workloads, about the prioritization. We'd encourage both the people who are putting together the terms of reference for those organizations and the organizations themselves to build in time to participate in these reviews. They are an important part of the continuous improvement process for ICANN. Consider for future organizational reviews how to balance the need to get them done with getting them done right, and maybe the timeline should reflect that.	Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ICANN Board Member, Chair of the Structural Improvements Committee: It is important to get it done right. And the issue of community workload is very high on the Board mind right now. It's been discussed a few times. Staff is always ensuring that it is apparent on our agenda, and we ask for feedback from you in terms of the review. We heard quite a bit of feedback and it's all valuable. I'm not sure that we've heard enough on whether or not the schedule is okay. And so for the community representatives, please go back, consult with your community, and give staff input on whether or not the schedule is okay with you. And if it's not okay we need to hear that so that Board decision will reflect the community need and constraints.
27	<a href="#">James Gannon</a> , Cyber Invasion Ltd	Support proposed timeline and schedule. Deference to the availability of staff must be made when scheduling these reviews.	
34	<a href="#">Jen Wolfe</a> , Chair of the GNSO Review Working Party	-Additional time given to the GNSO Review via several extensions allowed for a better outcome and end result. We urge you to consider allotting additional time for other Reviews and their respective Working Parties so that the time	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>and consideration can be given to obtain quality results in the survey and interview process and quality feedback to the report produced by the independent examiner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider the impact of scheduled reviews on the volunteer workload. Qualified, experienced and knowledgeable community members willing to dedicate focused and significant effort are an essential component of this important accountability mechanism functioning effectively.</li> <li>- The GNSO Review Working Party (20 volunteers) has put in significant energy and time to help make the GNSO Review and recommendations useful and supportive of continuous improvement. The broader community also contributed to the GNSO Review in important ways by offering their views and feedback - 178 people completed online surveys and 40 people participated in interviews. We expect significant volunteer time to be invested into planning and implementing needed improvements. We fully support this approach to conducting future Organizational Reviews and urge you to ensure that adequate time and volunteer resources are available not just to conduct each Review, but as importantly, to contribute to a productive implementation of Review recommendations and applying lessons learned to future reviews.</li> </ul>	
37	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	Agrees with proposed schedule for Organizational Reviews.	
43	<a href="#">Richard Westlake,</a> Westlake Governance Limited	Provide these comments to reinforce and complement Richard Westlake's verbal comment during the Public Session held at ICANN53 on 24 June 2015. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Endorse the comments submitted by Jen Wolfe, Chair of the GNSO Review Working Party (see comment 34). We agree in particular that the extensions of time for the GNSO Review,</li> </ul>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>made at the request of the community, have allowed for a better outcome and end result. Recommend that additional time be built into future reviews, to allow in particular for adequate consideration of draft findings and the first draft report.</p> <p>- Acknowledge the heavy workload imposed on the volunteers and consider it is essential that the timetable should take this into consideration.</p>	
45	<a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a> , Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	Re: Organizational Reviews: Supportive of a changed timeline and schedule. We would cautiously note that deference to the availability of staff must be made when scheduling these reviews as overburdening of staff may have follow on impact on other areas of ICANN. We also believe that the bylaws should always be adhered to, until and unless they are altered using full ICANN bottom up processes for the sake of accountability.	
51	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	<p>-Deeply appreciate the modification to the internal Organizational Review Schedule outlined in this proposal/plan. 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.”</p> <p>-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. However, some concerns were noted about the proposed</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		schedule, including an observation that the new program requires at least this 5 year cycle approach.	
<b>2 – Use Planning and Project Management Tools for AoC Reviews</b>			
21	<a href="#">Edward Morris</a> , GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	Agree in principle and would like to know more.	
28	<a href="#">James Gannon</a> , Cyber Invasion Ltd	<p>-Applaud ICANN for adopting the PMI standards for project management; believe that working within this well tested framework will provide important structure to the management and execution of these reviews.</p> <p>-With a number of concurrent reviews and complex overlap of community resources and time, suggest employing a strong program manager to guide both ICANN and the community through this critical time.</p> <p>-Program Manager to guide the interrelation between the various projects and advise on the complex scheduling and resource management challenges.</p>	
38	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	- Agrees with the need to develop a clear and focused Review scope during the planning phase. Recommends that most Review meetings be held virtually or allowed for remote participation. Review terms would be shorter since, through virtual meetings, travel time is eliminated and time is more efficiently used.	
46	<a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a> , Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	<p>While we can agree to project management by the ICANN staff, we cannot agree with any ICANN staff work that would affect the content of the reviews or of the milestones. We also cannot agree to any streamlining that would not be subject to change by the review team once it is constituted.</p> <p>-Support adopting the PMI standards for project management; believe that working within this well tested framework will provide important structure to the management and execution of these reviews.</p> <p>-With a number of concurrent reviews and complex overlap of community resources and time, suggest employing a strong</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>program manager to guide both ICANN and the community through this critical time.</p> <p>-Program Manager to guide the interrelation between the various projects and advise on the complex scheduling and resource management challenges.</p>	
52	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	<p>-Welcome 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.”</p> <p>-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 Organizational.</p>	
<b>3 – Streamline AoC Review Teams and Review Duration</b>			
22	<a href="#">Edward Morris</a> , GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	<p>While we all should applaud efforts to professionalize and make more efficient the work and project management of the AoC Review teams, there is a real danger that in doing so the community will cede effective control over the Reviews to staff and indeed to the process itself. I would need to see more of the specific proposals to more fully and intelligently comment on this proposal.</p>	
39	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	<p>It is paramount to streamline AoC Review terms and durations whenever possible and without unduly rushing the process.</p>	
47	<a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a> , Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	<p>-We strongly support the idea the review teams can constitute the equivalent of an Implementation Review Team from amongst its members.</p> <p>-In general we do not support the manner in which measures for streamlining reviews is being proposed.</p>	
53	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl</a>	<p>Based upon experiences as contributors and engaged</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
	<a href="#">Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	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.	
<b>4 - Focus Organizational Reviews on Operational Effectiveness</b>			
23	<a href="#">Edward Morris</a> , GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	Agree with the self-assessment approach and community empowerment implicit in its adoption.	
36	<a href="#">Steven Metalitz</a> , IPC	We note proposal for structural change be excluded from the scope of all organizational reviews going forward, and be dealt with only after the respective review is finalized. IPC has no opinion on whether this approach might be viable for some of the organizational reviews that are upcoming. We strongly believe, however, that the top-down decision to impose this sequencing on the current GNSO review was a costly and ill-considered mistake that has undermined confidence in ICANN’s organizational review process and led to the procurement of an expensive GNSO review report that will be of limited utility.  We urge that this conclusion with regard to “focus[ing] each organizational review on operational effectiveness,” to the exclusion of structural change issues, be reconsidered.	
40	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	- Supports proposals for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Organizational Reviews. However, any involvement by representatives of the organization under review should not replace or bias the work of the independent examiner. Otherwise, the integrity and independence of the review process could be comprised. - Recommends a clarification when and by whom structural changes would be assessed, considered and implemented.	
44	<a href="#">Richard Westlake</a> ,	- To develop a more relevant set of 360 Survey questions, a	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
	Westlake Governance Limited	<p>limited number of interviews or small focus group meetings should be conducted, by the Independent Examiner, before the questions for the 360 Survey are finalized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 360 Survey resulted in large amounts of data, but it should be acknowledged that, even with up to 150 responses, exclusively in English (from a large global community of indeterminate size), the results cannot be considered statistically valid in a quantitative sense. Rather, they provide qualitative guidance about the questions they answer.</li> <li>- Current review system results largely in an ICANN that is the sum of several well-reviewed parts, with no comprehensive examination of the whole. Since ICANN’s operations have evolved significantly in the last decade, and usage of the Internet has also changed dramatically over that time, we would recommend that at some stage in the relatively near future, after the IANA Stewardship Transition, such a review, which would incorporate ICANN as a whole with its component parts, might generate valuable strategic insights into how it might adapt to remain relevant and fit for its purpose over the next decade and beyond.</li> </ul>	
48	<a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a> , Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need greater participation by the organization under review throughout the entire process of the review. This needs to begin with a return to the policy of an initial terms of reference for a review being done by the organization under review.</li> <li>- An organization that wished also to review its internal organization should be free to do so.</li> </ul>	
54	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	In full support of efforts to undertake a continuous improvement program, relating to Organizational (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.	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
<b>5 – Consider Establishing an Alternate Process (to Organizational Reviews) to Examine Strategic Issues</b>			
24	<a href="#">Edward Morris</a> , GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	Agreed. Organizational reviews should focus on the “trees” while alternate processes should be developed to address the ICANN “forest”.	
41	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	Agrees that it may be appropriate to assess continued purpose as part of a holistic cross-organizational review of ICANN. The alternative process should be consistent with Bylaws requirement that reviews be conducted no less than every five years.	
49	<a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a> , Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	<p>-Support changes in the bylaws assertion that the Board shall be the sole director of organizational reviews. We realize these are not changes currently proposed, but would like to see such a change discussed by the ICANN community. While the Board may have accountability oversight over the SOAC, a reciprocal check for the SOAC’s ability to determine the Board’s composition would be beneficial. It should not be the sole director of SOAC reviews.</p> <p>-We do not support individual reviews of a SOAC continued existence. There is a larger architecture at plan with the existence of the various SO and ACs. If any change is to be made in the structure at the SOAC level, that structure should be reviewed by the ICANN community in its entirety. We would support such an organizational review of the SOACs and their situation within the overall ICANN structure. This consideration of the entire mix becomes important in regard to those SOAC that may assume the role of [members/designators] as eventually recommended and accepted by CCWG-Accountability.</p> <p>- In no case should such a review occur before the full implementation of Work Stream 1 (WS1) has been completed. The first such review could be considered as part of WP2, or could be delayed until after Work Stream 2 is complete.</p>	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
55	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	<p>-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.</p> <p>-Agree with other commenter suggesting that it may indeed be timely and appropriate to undertake a wider ICANN' structure and function' Review.</p>	
<b>TOPIC: Implementation of Review Recommendations</b>			
1	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Mark Mc Fadden, InterConnect Communications	Are we going to be able to see publicly on the ICANN Web site, those dashboards -- the progress that is reflected in those project management activities?	Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff: Yes
5	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Chuck Gomes	<p>Emphasized importance of prioritizing recommendations from the GNSO Review - quite a few of the 36 recommendations are going to probably have significant cost implications if they're approved.</p> <p>With regard to implementation, to the extent it's possible, syncing the implementation efforts with the budget Cycle.</p>	Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: In regards to costs, it probably might be worthwhile to take some creative views on that in terms of doing amortization of that effort through uses of smaller projects that can be spread out across time. In regards to syncing through the budget cycle, that's absolutely critical. That's why the only things that should bust through the budget cycle are those immediate things that are either in progress, in which case they should already be budgeted, or those that have to be taken care of immediately. Otherwise, getting it into the strategic plan and getting it into the operating plans, gets it into the budget cycle.
8	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational</a>	-Encouraged to hear that there will be more clarity on the	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
	<a href="#">Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Alan Greenberg	<p>implementation -- clarity and detail on implementation of ATRT2. Some of them right now are quite clear. You even referenced this specific recommendation and say what you're doing. Some of them are so opaque that one has to believe that either nothing is going on or you forgot to mention what it is.</p> <p>-If you're expecting groups to prioritize things, they're going to need a lot more information and feedback from staff quickly right at the end of the process when the recommendations are coming together.</p> <p>-I'm pleased to hear that the Board has reviewed the reviews. You might consider talking to the people who are on the review teams, the ones who wrote the recommendations, and seeing whether they think the implementation is going well or not.</p>	
11	Matogoro Jabhera (via remote hub from Tanzania)	I just need to know more detail on that slide number 15. Because I see zero complete, 100% in progress. What does this mean?	
16	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Jonathan Zuck	Where there barriers to implementation? Was it the amount of time? Why did the ATRT2 team feel the need to bring recommendations from ATRT1 into their recommendations? Or were there other issues with implementation?	Denise Michel, ICANN staff: Part of it was an understanding and the recommendation, different views of what the ultimate objective and what closure meant for each of the recommendations, and so some of the ATRT1 recommendations were, when looked at with fresh eyes by ATRT group, they felt that additional work could and should be done and so they brought in some of those recommendations and noted them in ATRT2. One of the changes we're proposing for the review team is to make sure we have some time, after they submit their final recommendation, so we have a much -

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
			- a clearer understanding and guidance from them on implementation, which should help address that.
17	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Chuck Gomes	What is the status of incomplete recommendations from ATRT1? The community deserves to know the status.	
<b>TOPIC: Scope of Organizational Reviews</b>			
2	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Mark Mc Fadden, InterConnect Communications	I would like to see the scope of the review being able to be reviewed by the community. Not just the SIC, but actually input from the community on the scope of that review. There needs to be a formal process (such as public comment) in which the community gives input into that scope.	<p>Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: The community was given ample opportunity to provide input into the criteria during the early stages under the review working party. The scope of the review is the structure of the criteria. If we're going to look at -- if something is going to be looked at, it's going to be included in the criteria. And then how that criteria is going to be examined is determined by whether it's going to be included in 360s, it's going to be included in interviews, it's -- where it's going to be included. But the scope of the review includes all the criteria.</p> <hr/> <p>Jen Wolfe, GNSO Review Working Party Chair: We did understand the concern about structure. So we did add some questions that allowed for that to be commented upon. So we were able to provide that feedback that we thought should be able to be provided in scope.</p>
13	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational</a>	-At some point along the way the SIC decided that no, they	Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member:

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
	<a href="#">Reviews Session 24</a> <a href="#">June 2015</a> Avri Doria	<p>would do the term of reference and then, you know, perhaps we could consult on it. But if they said there would be no structural review, that meant there would be no structural review. And it didn't matter what anyone else had to say. I find that extremely problematic.</p> <p>-In terms of looking at the specificity of the GNSO, when we did this experiment at the last review with this bicameral notion, it was with the explicit understanding that we would review it after we had done it a while. We've done it for a while. So the fact that we were barred from actually doing structural review is really quite problematic.</p> <p>-The Board has to really consider what its proper role in reviewing a bottom-up self organization -- self organizing group is and that certainly determining the conditions of the review is incompatible with that bottom-up organization.</p>	<p>-There was opportunity inside the review working party as it started putting together criteria to do that. Now, the criteria that is laid out is that which is common to all organizations. All organizations have elections. All organizations have some way or form of identifying participants and members. All organizations have a responsibility for levels of participation and diversity. Those are all core, if you will, attributes and they all would work well within a bottom-up or a top-down assessment of an organization and they all point to the organizational effectiveness of the organization.</p> <p>-One of the things with regards to structure is that looking at things only from the viewpoint of structure is that you don't necessarily see everything from the other side of how effective some things are. Because it's been clouded by your look at the structure. On the other hand, if you look at things from the viewpoint of organizational effectiveness, one of the things that may be hampering that organizational effectiveness is the structure is standing in the way of it occurring.</p> <p>- In addition, there is nothing that has ever stopped the GNSO at any point in time from undertaking a change to their own structure. So waiting for five years for it to occur is something that you did not have to do.</p>

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
			- If in the course of implementing the recommendation to do something you say, the best way to do that is a change of structure, then that is part of the implementation. So you have to take a broader view at the implementation.
<b>TOPIC: CCWG Accountability and Review Process</b>			
3	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Fiona Asonga, Kenyan Exchange Point and a former member of ART2, currently with CCWG-Accountability	Staff should engage with CCWG-Accountability relative to reviews. When we create that synergy, we save on time, we save on effort, and we save on the back and forth between the community and staff on the processes.	Denise Michel, ICANN staff: We have a placeholder. And we're very cognizant of the discussions and work that's going on within the accountability framework discussions. And we're keeping very close tabs. And we'll make sure that we incorporate any final outcomes that are relevant to reviews.
<b>TOPIC: General/Other</b>			
4	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Chuck Gomes	I really appreciate the fact that staff has decided to relook at the workload and to move some things out a little bit. I think that's critical at this stage and point. I want to reiterate Ray's thanks and compliments of Jen and the job that she has done in leading the review working party.	
10	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Matogoro Jabhera (via remote hub from Tanzania)	What is the entry point for a new member who may be interested in joining this initiative?	Denise Michel, ICANN staff: An immediate way to participate is to offer your public comments online in the public comment forum that's open regarding reviews, the scheduled and proposed improvements. If you're interested in participating in one of the upcoming reviews on ICANN's Web site, there will be posted a solicitation for volunteers. So those are the two primary ways that you can be involved. And, of course, as the upcoming reviews go forward, they do a

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
			whole series of outreach and engagement and ask for input from the community. So you can be looking for those as well.
14	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Jonathan Zuck	I would like to thank the Board for finding money off budget for the CCT review requirements for the survey and the economic study because it was something we needed to get to quickly.	
15	<a href="#">AoC &amp; Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015</a> Jonathan Zuck	Some of the frustration with the structure actually has to do with how that structure's interpreted by staff. The depth to which you dive into the structure when forming review teams becomes significant. That the fact that there's no one from the IPC that's ever been on a review team, for example, is sort of a function of well, one person from the CSG. So treating them as that aligned I think has been part of the frustration.	
25	<a href="#">Edward Morris</a> , GNSO Council / NCSG / NCUC	The community should be involved in the procurement and selection of the firms, if any, hired to provide guidance and advice in these Reviews. For those companies bidding on a contract who have previously worked in the ICANN community, comments should be solicited by staff from those parties affected by past reviews as to their view of past performance of the candidate firm.	
42	<a href="#">Lori Schulman</a> International Trademark Association (INTA)	Reiterates its position set forth in its recent comment on the CCWG Accountability proposal that the AoC in general should be incorporated into ICANN's bylaws. The AoC is a critical mechanism to help ensure ICANN accountability and emphasizing the importance of the AoC by incorporating it into ICANN's bylaws would be highly desirable—especially at this critical time for ICANN during the IANA function transition.	
56	<a href="#">Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr</a> ALAC	Suggest that the closer collaboration and effective interaction between the staff tasked with management of these Review processes (in particularly the Organizational Reviews), could be taken a pilot project to encourage (if not require) better	

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Comment	Initial Response
		<p>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 organization as a whole as well as relating to its component parts.</p>	