

# At-Large Accountability and Transparency Review Team 1 Workspace

[Para traducir a español](#)

[Pour traduire en Français](#)

---

## Announcements

[ALAC Statement on ATRT Final Recommendations - January 2011 \(Draft\)](#)

[Final Recommendations of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team \(31 December 2010\)](#)

[Suggested ALAC Comment on ATRT Draft Recommendations \(drafted by Improvement WT A\) \(18 November 2010\)](#)

[Public Consultation: Questions to the Community on Accountability and Transparency within ICANN \(ends 1 July10\)](#)

---

## Background

[Affirmation of Commitments](#) (30 September 2009)

[Affirmation of Commitments Reviews](#)

[Call for Applicants](#) for the Position of Volunteer Review Team Member (11 January 2010 --updated 19 February 2010)

[Composition of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team](#) (12 March 2010)

---

## At-Large Community Accountability and Transparency Review Team Representative

At-Large Community Representative: [Cheryl Langdon-Orr](#)

[Communication](#) between At-Large Community and the At-Large Community Accountability and Transparency Representative

---

## Meetings of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team

[Click here](#) for the Activities of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team website, including agendas, recordings, preliminary notes and minutes

**12 April 2010 Teleconference**

[26 April 2010 Teleconference](#)

[5-6 May 2010 Meeting](#) - including agenda and remote participation information

---

--	--

## At-Large Community Complaints/Issues 'Box'

A  
t-  
L  
a  
r  
g  
e  
C  
o  
m  
m  
u  
n  
i  
t  
y  
S  
u  
g  
g  
e  
s  
t  
i  
o  
n  
'  
B  
o  
x'

The minutes for the 5/6 May meetings have just gone up (17 May). This is of course a good thing but I can't help but find it very underwhelming. Some questions and some suggestions for putting forward to the review team and its support.

- Why release preliminary minutes and final minutes at the same time? What's the point?\* Why did it take 11 days to publish minutes? (especially when anyone could listen in live)\* I was pretty sure that the Review Team said it was going to release documents it was provided - and not just the minutes. I don't see any of them - there was a series of questions from the team, and some answers; there were several presentations; there was an example of a Board book from an old Board meeting. All these materials are important reference documents. If the review team asked them to be published (which I thought I had heard being decided) there why have they not been published - it would have taken 10 minutes to do so.\* Why are the minutes in a PDF format - hard to get at. Why not HTML?\* Do you feel the minutes are sufficiently **accessible**? They don't include a summary for example. And they don't break out action points. Nor do they give much indication as to what the arguments for and against were, or who made them. It reads like a long series of bullet points. Yes, it is a summary of the meeting topic-by-topic but it is far from a useful summary of what the Review Team is doing and where it is going.\* Are there plans to translate Review Team material so non-English speakers can understand it?\* When will the Board resolution wiki be available? Is there any form of deadline attached to it?\* Why has the 15 May "Deadline to post questions to Community" been missed? Is anyone keeping track of this workflow?\* Why is there no link to the Review Team's work on the front page? In fact, there's no link on the Independent Reviews webpage either. *(contributed by Kieren McCarthy on May 17 2:50pm)*

ICANN unabashedly holds secret meetings for registrars. Details are deliberately hidden from the community, and filtered results documents are not posted until after the meetings are concluded. They are planned and paid for by ICANN but closed to all of the community except for contracted parties. ICANN staff claims that no specific financial or contractual discussions take place, yet cannot provide a reason for having closed meetings except for the assertion that the registrars want it that way. If At-Large asked for ICANN-funded closed meetings we'd be ridiculed, yet this practice is continuing unabated. Upon being asked to allow community members as non-participating observers, staff responded with hostility and a refusal to consider even modest proposals. *(submitted by Evan Leibovitch, May 13)*

When the GAC makes formal policy recommendation to the Board, it is required to either act or provide a reply why it did not act. Such practice is not offered to the Board's other formally-constituted Advisory Committee, the ALAC - why? *(Submitted by Evan Leibovitch, May 13)*

Is the title of the RT not:  
Ensuring accountability, transparency and the interests of global Internet users? It is important for At-Large this last point. Maybe a link to the page of the Future Structure, Accountability and Transparency of ICANN At-Large WG can be useful?  
[https://st.icann.org/working-groups/index.cgi?future\\_structure\\_accountability\\_and\\_transparency\\_of\\_icann](https://st.icann.org/working-groups/index.cgi?future_structure_accountability_and_transparency_of_icann)  
SeB  
*contributed by Sebastien Bachollet on May 5 12:03am*

When the subsequent versions of the DAG continue to ignore the recommendations of the community regarding the application fees, especially after the At-Large Summit in Mexico, I can't say that it is an accountable behaviour  
Also, most of the documents are in English. How can the non-English speaking community understand and react.  
Closed meetings with registrars can't be explained. Transparency is a whole; no exception can be justified.  
(Submitted by Tijani BEN JEMAA on 17 June 2010 at 16:07 UTC)

Hi, I don't see a login space, maybe it happened automatically, anyway, this is Beau Brendler. My complaint regards accountability and transparency is the following:  
More than a year ago now, the ICANN board's structural improvements committee invited proposals from stakeholder groups interested in creating GNSO reform. I submitted my proposal for a new consumer constituency within the GNSO on time, according to ICANN's parameters. I re-drafted it on time when asked. I have been asked at ICANN meetings, usually without prior notice or preparation, to talk about the constituency and its intentions, sometimes facing hostile circumstances and, later on in the process, personal attacks against my reputation that still remain unresolved. In Seoul, I was asked by the structural improvements committee to explain the constituency and its intent again. I was told by the board to be patient and to continue to recruit potential members. I have done so, despite the difficulty -- acknowledged by the board members present at the Seoul meeting -- of recruiting groups to join what amounts to an unofficial organization with no standing.  
And I am not the only one to be jerked around by the ICANN board on this matter. At least three other groups proposed constituencies also, and all were rejected -- the consumer constituency proposal is the only one that remains.  
I therefore find it amusing that ICANN and its board talk about valuing accountability and transparency. No one on the board, with the exception of Roberto Gaetano, has ever said anything to me personally about the consumer constituency and its development. (Roberto's comments, in fact, were not directed necessarily at the constituency, but at my unsuccessful attempt to secure a GNSO council seat representing the public interest.) In Nairobi, the board met with the NCSG about its proposed consumer interest group which had just taken shape, ignoring the consumer constituency proposal (which had been on the table MORE THAN A YEAR by then), and by extension ignoring volunteers who have spent three years advocating for consumer issues within ICANN.  
Still, nothing has been said or done about the consumer constituency proposal. Last spring I endured repeated personal attacks from members of the ICANN community, some of them libelous, based on the disclosed or perceived undisclosed intent of the constituency. I was encouraged by ICANN staff to complain to the ombudsman about it, which I did. A report was released with recommendations, but to my knowledge, was not acted on or even mentioned or discussed. Or was it? No one talked to me about it. Is this transparency and accountability? Is this how ICANN expects to attract and retain talented, motivated volunteers?  
Further, does ICANN expect that opening up the tent to consumer groups is going to give it some "cover" when it comes to accountability and transparency? Certainly not. Whether it's the consumer constituency or the NCSG's consumer interest group, the increased presence of public interest groups in the ICANN arena will demand more accountability, not less. Since ICANN's current "GNSO reform" system is so dramatically, utterly flawed, how can we expect board deliberation on the merits of "constituency" vs. "interest group" to be any less flawed? There has been no transparency on this whatsoever. What's going on behind those closed doors? What are the points being raised for or against the creation of a constituency vs. creation of a "public interest group" in NCSG? Why is the board delaying a decision? What private meetings and discussions on the topic have taken place? Why have the co-chairs of the consumer constituency not been invited to them?  
What is the board hiding?  
*Beau Brendler*  
contributed by Guest User on Jun 17 11:18am

## Resources for Accountability and Transparency Review Team

[Accountability and Transparency Review Team Information Page](#)

[ICANN Transparency resource page](#)

Is the title of the RT not:  
Ensuring accountability, transparency and the interests of global Internet users?

It is important for At-Large this last point.

Maybe a link to the page of the Future Structure, Accountability and Transparency of ICANN At-Large WG can be useful?  
[https://st.icann.org/working-groups/index.cgi?future\\_structure\\_accountability\\_and\\_transparency\\_of\\_icann](https://st.icann.org/working-groups/index.cgi?future_structure_accountability_and_transparency_of_icann)  
SeB

contributed by Sebastien Bachollet on May 5 12:03am

The minutes for the 5/6 May meetings have just gone up (17 May). This is of course a good thing but I can't help but find it very underwhelming. Some questions and some suggestions for putting forward to the review team and its support.

- Why release preliminary minutes and final minutes at the same time? What's the point?
- Why did it take 11 days to publish minutes? (especially when anyone could listen in live)
- I was pretty sure that the Review Team said it was going to release documents it was provided - and not just the minutes. I don't see any of them - there was a series of questions from the team, and some answers; there were several presentations; there was an example of a Board book from an old Board meeting. All these materials are important reference documents. If the review team asked them to be published (which I thought I had heard being decided) there why have they not been published - it would have taken 10 minutes to do so.
- Why are the minutes in a PDF format - hard to get at. Why not HTML?
- Do you feel the minutes are sufficiently **accessible**? They don't include a summary for example. And they don't break out action points. Nor do they give much indication as to what the arguments for and against were, or who made them. It reads like a long series of bullet points. Yes, it is a summary of the meeting topic-by-topic but it is far from a useful summary of what the Review Team is doing and where it is going.
- Are there plans to translate Review Team material so non-English speakers can understand it?

- When will the Board resolution wiki be available? Is there any form of deadline attached to it?
- Why has the 15 May "Deadline to post questions to Community" been missed? Is anyone keeping track of this workflow?
- Why is there no link to the Review Team's work on the front page? In fact, there's no link on the Independent Reviews webpage either.

*contributed by Guest User on May 17 2:49pm*

---

Sorry - Guest User above was me - hadn't logged in.

*contributed by Kieren McCarthy on May 17 2:50pm*

---

Hi, I don't see a login space, maybe it happened automatically, anyway, this is Beau Brendler.

My complaint regards accountability and transparency is the following:

More than a year ago now, the ICANN board's structural improvements committee invited proposals from stakeholder groups interested in creating GNSO reform. I submitted my proposal for a new consumer constituency within the GNSO on time, according to ICANN's parameters. I re-drafted it on time when asked. I have been asked at ICANN meetings, usually without prior notice or preparation, to talk about the constituency and its intentions, sometimes facing hostile circumstances and, later on in the process, personal attacks against my reputation that still remain unresolved.

In Seoul, I was asked by the structural improvements committee to explain the constituency and its intent again. I was told by the board to be patient and to continue to recruit potential members. I have done so, despite the difficulty -- acknowledged by the board members present at the Seoul meeting -- of recruiting groups to join what amounts to an unofficial organization with no standing.

And I am not the only one to be jerked around by the ICANN board on this matter. At least three other groups proposed constituencies also, and all were rejected -- the consumer constituency proposal is the only one that remains.

I therefore find it amusing that ICANN and its board talk about valuing accountability and transparency. No one on the board, with the exception of Roberto Gaetano, has ever said anything to me personally about the consumer constituency and its development. (Roberto's comments, in fact, were not directed necessarily at the constituency, but at my unsuccessful attempt to secure a GNSO council seat representing the public interest.)

In Nairobi, the board met with the NCSG about its proposed consumer interest group which had just taken shape, ignoring the consumer constituency proposal (which had been on the table MORE THAN A YEAR by then), and by extension ignoring volunteers who have spent three years advocating for consumer issues within ICANN.

Still, nothing has been said or done about the consumer constituency proposal. Last spring I endured repeated personal attacks from members of the ICANN community, some of them libelous, based on the disclosed or perceived undisclosed intent of the constituency. I was encouraged by ICANN staff to complain to the ombudsman about it, which I did. A report was released with recommendations, but to my knowledge, was not acted on or even mentioned or discussed. Or was it? No one talked to me about it. Is this transparency and accountability? Is this how ICANN expects to attract and retain talented, motivated volunteers?

Further, does ICANN expect that opening up the tent to consumer groups is going to give it some "cover" when it comes to accountability and transparency? Certainly not. Whether it's the consumer constituency or the NCSG's consumer interest group, the increased presence of public interest groups in the ICANN arena will demand more accountability, not less. Since ICANN's current "GNSO reform" system is so dramatically, utterly flawed, how can we expect board deliberation on the merits of "constituency" vs. "interest group" to be any less flawed? There has been no transparency on this whatsoever. What's going on behind those closed doors? What are the points being raised for or against the creation of a constituency vs. creation of a "public interest group" in NCSG? Why is the board delaying a decision? What private meetings and discussions on the topic have taken place? Why have the co-chairs of the consumer constituency not been invited to them?

What is the board hiding?  
Beau Brendler

*contributed by Guest User on Jun 17 11:18am*

---

At Large is the face of the user to ICANN. It is also the door to ICANN for Internet users.

Transparency is directly connected to communication. It seems that as long as information and communication regarding ICANN and its processes comes down the ALAC channel to the ALS members remains complex, technical, and mysterious... the actual **perception** of transparency regardless of what level of transparency ICANN is achieving and its success in this area may be questioned, doubted.

ALAC and its structures provides a way of legitimacy to ICANN with regard to ICANN's "open and transparent" decree. It is my opinion that more emphasis from ICANN should be spent on ALAC; its website, support of its outreach, RALOS, and programs designed to reach the Internet user in both clear communication and education. The benefits may be more user participation at the ALS level, including online commentary to the ICANN public comment pages.

Having greater public participation is a strong and crucial aspect to what ICANN stands for and what it is trying to do.

Annalisa Roger

*contributed by Guest User on Jun 20 5:24am*