**From:** Carlos Raul Gutierrez <[crg@isoc-cr.org](mailto:crg@isoc-cr.org)>

**Date:** Sunday, March 24, 2013 1:46 PM

**To:** "[lstrickling@ntia.doc.gov](mailto:lstrickling@ntia.doc.gov)" <[lstrickling@ntia.doc.gov](mailto:lstrickling@ntia.doc.gov)>

**Cc:** ATRT2 <[atrt2@icann.org](mailto:atrt2@icann.org)>

**Subject:** Re: [atrt2] Proposed Questions to the ICANN Community

Thank you Larry!

I think the draft is very good and will help our work. The section on comparing the work of the different reviews teams I think is fine (sections 1-7). Particularly question 1 is a very good starter!

For the section on 9.1 issues (from question 8 on) , while using all of the same material and structure, I would like to get feedback from a more specific sub-set of additional questions in case they don´t have specific cases to bring forward, but only a general feelings.

I think that Board and GAC (9.1 **a) & b)**) are formal bodies and for legitimacy should be subject to clear checks and balances. I would like to know what stakeholders think about its efficiency and accountability. I can imagine a sub-set of question to sections 8 & 9 of the draft so as to get a better impression of the general image of Board and GAC’s work in the eyes of the community:.

·         Are you aware how the process under which they are nominated/elected?

·         Do you think they always follow clear rules and proceedings?

·         Do you think they take decisions in a transparent way?

·         Do you have a good sense of their rationale for taking decisions and giving advice?

·         What should the ATRT2 ask them specifically to change in the way they normally work?

·         Would any known metrics allow you to better follow up their work?

·         Do you think they should stay for longer/shorter periods of times?

·         Do you see for individual members any source of potential conflict with the rest of the community?

·         Do your think that there is (since ATRT1) a fair chance for a revision of their decisions?

On the other hand he multistakeholder policy making process (9.1 **c), d) & e)**) is where the mandate for the Board emanates from, and I would like to know what the community thinks about its effectiveness and transparency of the of the PDP process. Questions under section 11 are already very good (9.1 d), the best ones I would say. But as with the first list of work items out of the first LAX meeting, there is very little on public input (9.1 c) & e) and I would expect us to go much deeper into it:

·         Do you think it is easy to put forward new public inputs? All year round? When did you use it last?

·         How do you rate ICANNs staff work in processing public inputs? Do they help the community finding out what the pros and cons of those inputs are in a CLEAR and transparent way?

·         How do you think the process can be improved?

·         Do you embrace the decisions of the Board after an internal review of it in your community and/or working group?

·         Do you feel that the GAC is doing a good job advising the board?

·         Have you asked for a review of Board decision? Which one?

·         Do you think communication **between** the different SO/ACs on public inputs is sufficient and transparent?

·         Do you think there is a fair chance for discussions between the different SO/AC during the public meetings

·         Do you think some communities have a larger say than others?

·         How could the review process improve communication between the different stakeholders groups?

·         How should the ICANN community improve tis outreach to the larger internet community?

Wish you all a nice Sunday

Carlos Raul