

Overview of short term options

1. Short term options is limited to adjustment of the timeline for ATRT 3 (as updated 6 June 2018)
2. Short term proposal is limited to following options:
 - i. no changes to the schedule or scope;
 - ii. move forward with some aspects of the review (such as a focus only on the evaluation of prior ATRT recommendations);
 - iii. deferring the start of ATRT3 for approximately one year.

Each of the options are compared on following aspects:

- Advantage- Disadvantage
- Steps to execute option
- Cost savings

Public comment form short term -options to adjust timeline specific reviews

Includes ranking tables for start and scope ATRT3

<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/specific-reviews-short-term-timeline-fillable-form-06jun18-en.pdf>

Overview of Long-term options

The large number of Specific and Organizational Reviews taking place at the same time has strained volunteer and ICANN resources and prompted a discussion during ICANN61. The timing of Specific and Organizational Reviews has resulted (11) Organizational and Specific Reviews, in various phases of the review process taking place concurrently. In the short term the CSC Effectiveness and first IAAN naming Function Review need to be added as well.

Further, without any further action, in 3 years, ICANN will face the situation that this cycle of reviews will start again.

The paper mentions several options/principles on how to mitigate the risks / concurrence of the reviews

- Staggering the reviews to have no more than one Specific Review and two Organizational Reviews running concurrently;
- Adding timing criteria in order to initiate the next cycle of a Specific or Organizational Review, which could include factors such as a requirement that prior review recommendations be fully implemented and possibly operational for a period of time before the next review is initiated;
- Adding requirements that, like the Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT), other Specific Review teams complete their work within 12 months. This requirement could also be applicable to Organizational Reviews (although because Organizational Reviews are conducted by independent examiners based on contractual agreements, timing considerations are already incorporated into the process);
- Focusing Specific Review teams' work on topics of highest priority to the community; and

- Adding scheduling flexibility for Specific Reviews to the Bylaws, with appropriate checks and balances.

Depending on the options chosen i.e. the choices for conducting the reviews sections of the Bylaws would need to be modified.

Note: not included is reference to operating standards and their role and benefit for specific reviews.

Paper: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reviews-long-term-options-timeline-redline-06jun18-en.pdf>

Issues:

- Unclear what type of feed-back is wanted: on principles, issues of ccNSO with reviews.
- What are alternatives?
- Indication amendment of Bylaws may be needed, what is timeline impact? Will this result in timely adjustment to avoid the next resource tornado
- Operating Standards: how are they going to evolve, including the specific sections referred in parts of the Bylaws. What is timeline
- When is decision needed? Who is going to lead this process, what are timelines ?