ATRT2 Templates

[These templates are a tool to organize thinking and provide basis for informed debate in Los Angeles. The templates are not intended to be a report format.]

A.   Analysis of previous review teams recommendations

[Section A. should be completed for each recommendation made by the prior review teams. It is intended to document assessment of ATRT 2 of ICANN's implementation of prior recommendations.]

-   Recommendation

-   Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness

    [This section may include the following elements: Board approval of previous review teams' recommendations and directive to staff; staff/Board input via written and oral reports.]

-   Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness

-   Summary of other relevant research

-   ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)

    [*Complete* – recommendation has been implemented and all work has been completed.

    Incomplete – recommendation has not been implemented or has been implemented partially; no further work is being conducted.

    Ongoing – the work has not been completed and is ongoing.]

-   ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness [Includes rationale for the recommendation.]

B.   Proposed new recommendations

-   Recommendation for improvement to the review process

    Overarching questions:

1. Are the AoC review processes providing sufficient review and adequate recommendations that facilitate improvement in ICANN's accountability and transparency?

2. Given the periodic institutional reviews, as required in the ICANN bylaws, is there an aspect of "review fatigue" that undermines stakeholder or organizational effectiveness?

3. Are there alternative approaches to review that should be considered?

-   Background research undertaken

    Prior Review Team reports (ATRT1, WHOIS and SSR) provide some insight into the qualitative aspects of each review process. ATRT1 provided both an Overview of the Accountability and Transparency Review Process (see Appendix A) and Observations of the Review Process (see Appendix B). The WHOIS Review Team and the SSR Review Team did not provide discreet observations of the review process in their respective reports. ATRT2 will ask for input from former members of those review teams concerning the review process and whether the believe improvements can be made.

    ATRT2's review process has also provided some insights regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the review process. Issues that require further discussion include, but are not limited to:

    -   time allotted for the review process
    -   the mechanics of initiating data flow from ICANN staff to the review team
    -   the mechanics of obtaining community input at an early stage
    -   understanding of budget allocations for the Review Team activities
    -   dynamics of work stream organization
    -   volunteer aspects of the review team process

-   Relevant ICANN bylaws

    Article IV, section 4: 'periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee.' The goal of the reviews is 'determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in

structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.'

- o Summary of ICANN input

ICANN CEO and staff, during early interactions with ATRT2, identified the issue of "implementability" of AoC Review Team recommendations. Implementation of a recommendation may entail the use of human resources and other costs, the inputs and interaction of many units within ICANN and may pose legal complexities.

ICANN Board members asked whether ICANN was suffering from an excess of review processes. Some suggestions were made with respect to improving review processes including adding "audit-like" approaches to check accountability and transparency and to create efficiencies.

- o Summary of community input via the public comment process and face to face meetings

  [Not a summary, but some notable comments. Others to be included.]

  Mike Roberts questioned whether insider dynamics captured prior review teams

  Alejandro Pisanty – A large part of the recommendations are superfluous and engender greater bureaucracy. ATRT2 should to try to find a way to make recommendations less burdensome and more substantive.

  Nominet –One should have a full picture of the extent to which the recommendation is embedded into ICANN process and what the full effects of the implementation are. Implementation progress should feature as part of the Board update at every ICANN meeting. They should be given the highest visibility and priority.

- o Summary of other relevant research

- Relevant ICANN published policies

- Relevant ICANN published procedures

Organizational reviews are overseen by the Board's Structural Improvements Committee. The methodology of organizational reviews and background materials can be found here: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/reviews. ATRT2 will need to seek input from Committee members and from ACs and SOs who have undertaken said reviews.

- Draft recommendation including rationale

- Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

- Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Note: Links to relevant documents can be included, provided the link refers to a specific section of a given document. Alternatively, relevant section of other documents may be copies and pasted.