

At-Large Workspace: Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews

Public Comment Close	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
31 July 2018	Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews	ADOPTED 13Y, ON, OA	Sebastien Bachollet Daniel Khauka Nanghaka Vanda Scartezini	30 July 2018	31 July 2018	31 July 2018	03 August 2018	31 July 2018	Larisa Gurnick larisa.gurnick@icann.org	AL-ALAC-ST-0718-05-01-EN

Hide the information below, please click [here](#) >>

Brief Overview

Update 6 June 2018: On 5 June 2018, the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team submitted a [public comment](#) to request that all RDS-WHOIS2 related options be removed from the Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Specific Reviews public comment proceeding. The public comment period and associated [Short-Term Options document](#) [PDF, 88 KB] were updated accordingly. Any questions on the RDS-WHOIS2 request should be directed to the review team through their publicly archived input list: input-to-rds-whois2-rt@icann.org. Process-related questions can be addressed to reviews@icann.org.

The community is now invited to share public comments on short-term options involving the Third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) - by the close date of 6 July 2018.

Purpose: This public comment proceeding proposes **short-term options** pertaining to current reviews to address the workload of the volunteer community and impact on ICANN resources. Specifically, the aim of this public comment proceeding is to invite feedback on options on whether and how to adjust the timeline for two Specific Reviews to alleviate existing strain on volunteer and ICANN resources. The two reviews for consideration for short-term options are the third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) and the second Registration Directory Service Review (RDS-WHOIS2).

Current Status: The timing of Specific and Organizational Reviews mandated by the Bylaws has resulted in multiple reviews occurring at the same time. Currently, there are eleven Organizational and Specific Reviews, in various phases of the review process. This is in addition to policy development work and other work across the ICANN community. This high level of activity strains both volunteer and ICANN resources. During ICANN61, as the community was discussing ICANN's next budget cycle and planning, the volunteer and resource strain was frequently discussed. Based on feedback from the ICANN community, and as discussed with the community at ICANN61, ICANN organization presents some short-term options to alleviate the existing strain on volunteer and ICANN resources relating to reviews. This public comment proceeding seeks input on the options presented, or additional ideas, that might address the current circumstances and ease the heavy workload associated with current reviews.

Next Steps: After this public comment proceeding closes, ICANN organization will summarize and analyze the comments received and share those with the community and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) in identifying recommendations to the ICANN Board on paths forward.

Section I: Description and Explanation

From the discussions over the past months with the community and at ICANN61, there are several options available in the short-term to lessen the strain on the volunteers and to normalize the usage of ICANN resources across years. Of the eleven reviews that are currently ongoing there are two that, based upon their status and other ongoing related work, are the most likely to have the greatest cross-community impact on volunteer participation and resources in the event their scope or schedule are modified. These are two Specific Reviews:

1. ATRT3 – The Review Team has not yet been selected by the SO/AC chairs
2. RDS-WHOIS2 – The Review Team, appointed in June 2017, has identified the need to separate their work into multiple tracks because of the ongoing related work on the impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on WHOIS.

There are options presented for both of these reviews, from maintaining the current path of the review, to limiting scope, or in the case of ATRT3, considering a postponement of no more than one year. Each option carries with it advantages and disadvantages, and some options will result in potential cost savings. For an in-depth description of short-term options to adjust the timeline for Specific Reviews and summary charts, please refer to the resources in Section III.

Section II: Background

The timing of Specific and Organizational Reviews mandated by the Bylaws has resulted in multiple reviews occurring at the same time. Currently, eleven Organizational and Specific Reviews are underway in different phases of work (more information [here](#)). The work associated with these reviews is extensive and has a direct impact on many parts of the ICANN community. The number of concurrent reviews, the resulting demand on community resources, and review-related budget requirements prompted the ICANN community, ICANN organization, and ICANNBoard to consider possible avenues for short-term relief. For an in-depth description of short-term options to adjust the timeline for Specific Reviews and summary charts, please refer to the resources in Section III.

Long-term options to adjust the timeline of reviews: In addition to the short-term options pertaining to two Specific Reviews, ICANN is also presenting potential long-term solutions to streamline the review schedule in the future. Concurrent with this public comment proceeding, there is also a public comment proceeding setting out those long-term options to achieve more scheduling flexibility for future reviews (with appropriate checks and balances by the community and the ICANN Board) and meeting ICANN's accountability and transparency obligations in a more practical and sustainable manner. Similar to the principles that inform short-term options, the principles applicable to the long-term options aim to have no more than three to four reviews per year, recognize limited community resources, ensure adequate funding for reviews, and ensure efficiency and effectiveness of the reviews. For more information, please see the public comment proceeding: "[Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews](#)."

Section III: Relevant Resources

To help provide ease and clarity, this public comment proceeding includes:

- [Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews](#) [PDF, 88 KB] – a detailed description of short-term options and summary charts
- [A redlined version of the Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline](#) [PDF, 199 KB] for Specific Reviews to highlight the changes made to the original document
- [A fillable form](#) [PDF, 1.36 MB] – where you can select your preferred options and provide additional comments

If you have additional ideas, please use the "comment" section of the fillable form or "Submit Comment" above.

Section IV: Additional Information

- ICANN Bylaws: [Accountability and Transparency Review \(ATRT\)](#)
- ATRT [homepage](#)
- ATRT [workspace](#)
- ICANN Bylaws: [Registration Directory Service Review \(RDS-WHOIS\)](#)
- RDS-WHOIS2 [homepage](#)
- RDS-WHOIS2 [workspace](#)
- "[Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews](#)" Public Comment Proceeding

Section V: Reports

FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.



AL-ALAC-ST-0718-05-01-EN.pdf

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.

[Sebastien Bachollet](#)

The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews. The ALAC is responsible for representing the interests of Internet End Users within ICANN, and the accountability and transparency involved in all of the ICANN reviews including specific ones and more specifically on Accountability and Transparency Review Team implies a strong involvement of Internet End-Users voice.

We have the choice between 3 options regarding ATRT3:

A “No change” Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).

B “Limit Review to Implementation of Prior Recommendations” Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).

C “Commence RT work upon Board action on CCWG-WS2 recommendations” (with the work of the Review Team to start no later than 30 June 2019 and conclude within twelve months, as prescribed in the Bylaws).

For the ALAC, the best option is the option C, to be started no later than end of June 2019. With this option, the review team will be in charge of the evaluation of implementation of prior review recommendations and other topics, with no duplication or overlap with CCWG-WS2 implementation. Although the WS2 Rec will not likely have been implemented, there should be no prohibition on ATRT3 looking at them.

As a second option the ALAC could agree on option A. If this option is selected the ALAC suggests that the work of the review team goes from the 2018 AGM to 2019 AGM.

DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).

DRAFT N°2 for Comments

[Sebastien Bachollet](#)

July 24, 2018 (The comments are due for July 31, 2018.)

"Final" draft of the ALAC comments on Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews. As the other reviews are out of scope this comment concerns only the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 3 (ATRT3).

The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews. The ALAC is responsible for representing the interests of Internet End Users within ICANN, and the accountability and transparency involved in all of the ICANN reviews including specific ones and more specifically on Accountability and Transparency Review Team implies a strong involvement of Internet End-Users voice.

We have the choice between 3 options regarding ATRT3:

A "No change" Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).

B "Limit Review to Implementation of Prior Recommendations" Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).

C "Commence RT work upon Board action on CCWG-WS2 recommendations" (with the work of the Review Team to start no later than 30 June 2019 and conclude within twelve months, as prescribed in the Bylaws).

For the ALAC, the best option is the option C, to be started no later than end of June 2019. With this option, the review team will be in charge of the evaluation of implementation of prior review recommendations and other topics, with no duplication or overlap with CCWG-WS2 implementation. Although the WS2 Rec will not likely have been implemented, there should be no prohibition on ATRT3 looking at them.

As a second option the ALAC could agree on option A. If this option is selected the ALAC suggests that the work of the review team goes from the 2018 AGM to 2019 AGM.

DRAFT N°1 for Comments

[Sebastien Bachollet](#)

July 3, 2018

I would like to suggest a first draft of the ALAC comments on Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews. The comments are now due for July 31, 2018. As the other reviews are out of scope the proposal concern only ATRT3.

We have the choice between 3 options regarding ATRT3:

A "No change" Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).

B "Limit Review to Implementation of Prior Recommendations" Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).

C "Commence RT work upon Board action on CCWG-WS2 recommendations" (with the work of the Review Team to start no later than 30 June 2019 and conclude within twelve months, as prescribed in the Bylaws).

To discuss this choice, we have to take into account the following elements:

- Potential Topics
- Advantages
- Disadvantages
- Execution Needs
- \$ Savings in FY19

Regarding A and B, they must have already started. And it will take almost 3 more months to really start. Therefore, The ALAC considers that it is around the option C that we must work.

Topics suggested are:

- Evaluation of implementation of prior review recommendations and
- Other topics, limited to avoid duplication or overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics.

The ALAC suggests rephrasing the topics:

- Evaluation of implementation of prior review recommendations and
- Other topics, with no duplication or overlap with CCWG-WS2 implementation.

Advantages

- Lessened strain on volunteer and ICANN resources;
- Short-term deferral – date can be reasonably estimated.

The ALAC considers that at any moment the volunteers are putting a lot of resources on various projects. It is not sure that deferring the start of the work will change the availability of volunteer resources. But even if it is not the most important it may have positive aspect on ICANN staff resources.

Disadvantages

- Potentially critical reaction that ICANN is delaying its accountability commitments by deferring the review.

The ALAC didn't consider that such critics will be important as the community spend the last 3,5 years on ICANN Accountability Work Stream 1 (18 months) and Work Stream 2 (2 years).

Execution Needs

- Community agreement to defer;
- Community to determine appropriate course of action for volunteers who applied to serve in response to the call in January 2017; potential re-initiation of call.

The ALAC did agree to defer.

Regarding the volunteers the ALAC proposes the following course of actions:

- Request a confirmation of availability by volunteers who applied to serve in response to the call in January 2017 and were selected by the AC/SO leadership team and if they are still willing to join the review team to confirm them;
- Re-open a call for, if and where needed, add participants to the RT.

\$ Savings in FY19

- \$320,000 (Based on assumption that a limited number of face-to-face meetings would occur in FY19)

The ALAC doesn't consider that it is the more important element to be taken into account. But if on top of the other advantages cost saving is possible it is fine.

The ALAC takes this opportunity to hope that the FY20 will be smooth running and will allow for a real At-Large Summit (III).