

**Accountability & Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT 2)**  
**Conference Call with Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)**  
**Monday, 1 July 2013 – 14:00 UTC**  
**PRELIMINARY REPORT**

**Volunteer RT Members**

Alan Greenberg  
Avri Doria  
David Conrad  
Fiona Asonga  
Larry Strickling  
Lise Fuhr  
Olivier Crépin-Leblond  
Steve Crocker

**Apologies**

Brian Cute  
Jørgen Abild Andersen  
Tony Holmes

**BC Members**

Chris Chaplow  
Elisa Cooper  
Jeff Brueggeman  
Philip Corwin

**Invited Participants**

Feng Guo  
Fiona Alexander  
Paul Diaz

**ICANN Staff**

Alice Jansen  
Larisa Gurnick

**ISPCP**

Mikey O'Connor

**IPC**

Anne Aikman-Scalese  
Crescent Ezekwu  
David-Irving Thayer  
Dietmar Lenden  
Kristina, Rosette  
Jean-Christophe Vignes  
Jonathan Zuck  
Steve Metalitz

Recording and transcript may be found on the wiki at:

<https://community.icann.org/display/ATRT2/Conference+Call+-+Interaction+with+CSG>

The Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT2) received feedback from the Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) based on the following set of questions prepared by the ATRT2 in order to engage dialogue with the CSG:

1. Is the GNSO PDP working well, and if not, what needs to be done?
2. To what extent is ICANN able to avail itself of volunteer stakeholder efforts? What needs to be changed to increase this ability (if it is not already optimal)?
3. Only the BC submitted an input to the ATRT questionnaire and none of the constituencies answered the full questionnaire.
  - Can you give us a reason for the lack of comments or response?
  - Are we asking the wrong questions?
  - Asking in the wrong way?

*Specific questions based on [BC statement](#):*

4. BC used the term “material new obligations”. Can you give an idea of how this is used?
  
5. Can you give examples of the trend to top down decision-making; especially in the way non-AOC committees and WG are established.
  
6. What sort of evidence would be sufficient to allow the community to know its recommendations "are considered by ICANN staff and board when making decisions"?

The ATRT 2 received the following feedback:

- The IPC did not respond to the questionnaire as it was out of capacity: the amount of work and the number of available volunteers is not commensurate. The IPC plans to voice this to the Board in Durban. In addition, no capacity to do strategic planning.
- In addition to technical difficulty encountered with the interactive questionnaire (timed out), the wide scope of questions and the number of questions were overwhelming and required contemplation.
- Improved process for getting volunteers into the constituencies is needed as well as a ladder of learning so that they can be effective participants.
- Suggestion to have feedback calls as opposed to written submissions.
- There is concerted effort at outreach but no help to coordinate these efforts despite the significant allocation of resources. ICANN relies on volunteers but no collaboration and administrative difficulties (W9).
- Suggestion to identify ways for new participants to contribute in more manageable timeframe and expertise. Understanding how to participate and to become a member is very challenging. Self-identification information in outreach materials ought to be included.
- Summary of comments prepared by ICANN staff do not reflect comments accurately (weight etc) or ignore input received. Management of public comment process is poor and ought to be fully re-examined.
- There is top-down decision-making in the way working groups are established.
- PDP prioritizing may be needed: condense certain parts of the process or expedite them in certain circumstances.
- Budget clarity is needed.
- The CSG was imposed on BC, IPS, ISPCP constituencies but constituencies maintain integrity and autonomy in terms policy development which indicated a problem in structure.