



EN

AL-ALAC-ST-0731-03-00-EN
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: 31 July 2018
STATUS: Pending Ratification

AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ALAC Statement on Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews

Introduction

Alan Greenberg, At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Chair, developed an initial draft of the Statement on behalf of the ALAC.

On 18 July 2018, the first draft of the Statement was posted on its [At-Large workspace](#).

On 30 July 2018, an updated draft of the Statement was posted to the same workspace, and ICANN Policy Staff in support of the At-Large Community sent a Call for Comments on the Statement to the At-Large Community via the ALAC Work mailing list.

On 31 July 2018, the ALAC Chair submitted comment, and requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote.

In the interest of time, the ALAC Chair requested that the Statement be transmitted to the ICANN public comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this topic, with a note that the Statement is pending ALAC ratification.

ALAC Statement on Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews

The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the long term options for carrying out both Specific Reviews and Organizational Reviews.

The discussion of Organizational Reviews and Specific Reviews should be completely separate. They are different in EVERY way that impacts the community. All they have in common is:

- the word "Review";
- they cost money; and
- they involve staff effort.

Note that the last two bullets are common to virtually everything that ICANN does! HOW the two types of Reviews operate, what task they are charged with, and the requirement for significant community resources are SO different. Moreover, how well the two processes are working is like night and day.

Organizational Reviews

The next Organizational review is not due to start for a few years and the Board has the discretion to delay. STOP initiating Organizational Reviews until we assess how effective they have been (that is, a review of the past review processes) and develop a methodology to allow them to be cost effective (and that includes volunteer effort) and to be effective. The intent of the Bylaw requirement is to ensure that we be meaningful and effective, not to inflict punishment. The Bylaw requirement of occasional introspection is good. But what we have made it into is not. The current planned concept of dividing the review into two phases, analysis of issues and then recommendations is NOT sufficient.

When we figure out HOW to do such reviews in a meaningful and effective manner, make sure that we restart them to allow them to be scattered over time and not happen in large clusters. Note that part of this will be ensuring that the review is completed in a reasonable amount of time. 3+ years, which is what the At-Large Review has taken to get to the implementation phase, is NOT reasonable.

Specific Reviews

Change the Bylaws to give the Board some wiggle room with the timing of Specific Reviews going forward.

If we do not take explicit action, the next round of SSR3, RDS3 and ATRT4 will all start at about the same time. Based on when we expect them to start (using the Bylaw 5-year separation) and assessing the priority of them in respect to each other, spread these out to allow more effective use of financial and staff resources not having three running at the same time. To be clear, for the NEXT rounds, we may need more than "wiggle room" to ensure that they are spread out properly. The Bylaw wording must allow for such flexibility.

Lastly, when reporting on the review schedule, the "duration" of the review should be limited to the period of time from when the Review Team first meets (the original meaning of "convene" in the Bylaws), to the time when the final report is delivered.