Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT3)
Reviews

Draft Report for Public Comment

December 2019

Presentation SBT – for CPWG 20200115

Questions for the Public Comment

- Recommendation with respect to Specific and Organizational Reviews
  - (Section 10.5)
- Suggestion with respect to prioritization
  - (Section 12.4)

Issues
Specific and Organizational Reviews

ATRT3 believes it needs to address the issue of Specific and Organizational Reviews in a holistic fashion for the following reasons

- ATRT3 survey results with respect to Specific Reviews
  - Somewhat ineffective or ineffective
    - 67% of Structures (SO/ACs and their sub-components)
  - Should be reconsidered or amended
    - 91% of Structures
- ATRT3 survey results with respect to Organizational Reviews
  - Effective or very effective
    - 46% of Structures
  - Should be reconsidered or amended?
    - 83% of Structures
- Issues of timing and cadence of reviews
  - *"The Board believes that streamlining entails improving both the timing and the cadence of the reviews"*
  - Holding four Specific Reviews and seven Organizational Reviews every five years is a challenge for ICANN org and the community and needs to be addressed

Issues Specific and Organizational Reviews: Pending Recommendation

- ATRT3 could not come to consensus on a single proposal to address the issues related to Organizational and Specific Reviews

- Two distinct possibilities for this draft report

- ATRT3 is seeking input from the community on these to assist it in coming to a conclusion on this topic for its final report

Issues Specific and Organizational Reviews: Pending Recommendation

- Option 1
  - Keep the current set of Specific and Organizational reviews as they are given they are important accountability mechanisms for the community, in combination with a new oversight mechanism to manage reviews and the implementation of their recommendations
  - This new oversight mechanism should be the responsibility of a new Independent Accountability Office (in some ways similar to the Office of the Ombuds with respect to oversight), that includes responsibility for SO/AC accountability as well as well as the coordination of reviews and the implementation of their recommendations

Issues Specific and Organizational Reviews: Pending Recommendation

- Option 2 (1/2)
  - Organizational Reviews
    - Maintain the current concept of individual Organizational Reviews for each SO/AC
      - Conduct as three to five day workshops focused on SO/AC self-inspection in a context of continuous improvement
      - Conduct every three years, or more frequently, as determined by each SO/AC
      - The reports of these reviews would then feed into a new holistic review
    - Holistic Review
      - Conduct every 7 years for a maximum duration of 12 to 18 months to allow for the implementation and maturing of the recommendations made by the individual Organizational Reviews and those of the previous holistic review
      - The holistic review would focus on the improvements made by all SO/ACs as presented in their Organizational Review reports, as well as on the interactions between SOs and Acs

Issues Specific and Organizational Reviews: Pending Recommendation

- Option 2 (2/2)
  - Specific Reviews
    - Specific Reviews include
      - Accountability and Transparency Review (AT)
      - Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review (SSR)
      - Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review (CCT)
      - Registration Directory Service (RDS) Review (formerly WHOIS Review)
    - AT as well as the relevant portions of CCT and RDS would be combined into a single AT review which would be conducted every 7 years for a maximum duration of 12 to 18 months to allow for the implementation and maturing of the previous recommendations by this review
    - SSR could either be a three -to five- day workshop or a more traditional review period depending on topic