

# Response to Public Comment : Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews

Cheryl Langdon-Orr [langdonorr@gmail.com](mailto:langdonorr@gmail.com)

To begin with I should, of course, declare a couple of matters or 'interests' with regards to Reviews within ICANN, both Specific ones in general and ATRT's ( including the upcoming ATRT3) in particular...

As I have stated in a number of fora, I am a firm believer in the benefits to the ICANN Organisation and Community of a regular, effective and efficient Review(s) process that is predictable and best meets the needs and criteria stated in the objectives for such a process. I have also, in my professional life, worked in and managed various processes that are subject to high levels of 'Review' (QAS, Standards Australia panels, ISO9000/14000 as well as HACCP and NATA accredited scientific, industrial, agricultural, medical and commercial systems), so find regular formulaic processes of independent and external Review processes a worthwhile activity and have also served on the original ATRT as well as observing closely the activities of the following ATRT2, and the other Specific Reviews.

Firstly, Organisational and Specific Reviews need to be thought of, treated and managed in my view as segregated activities, they differ in fundamental ways including but not limited to the specificity of their scope and purpose, the nature of the 'reviewing party' (External Independent Examiner on contract vs requirements

On the matter of concurrence of reviews however in my view it should be reasonable to manage a balance with proper planning that also permits sufficient flexibility to ensure that say only 1 Specific and 2 Organisational (ideally at different stages of the usual processes of External Examiner review and reporting, Feasibility Assessment of the Recommendations made by the Independent External Examiner, and the work of the Implementation of the approved Recommendations) happen concurrently.

On the issue of Organisational Reviews and the cycle times of them, I believe it would be very wise to have a moratorium on these until a fulsome 'Review of Organisational Reviews' can be carried out, and that it is imperative that sufficient time has passed between Organisational Reviews for each part of the ICANN Community, to allow for proper and reasonable assessment of implemented recommendations and outcomes from the previous Organisational Review cycle. It should also be expected that the community that is being reviewed are fully engaged with the development of the Terms of Reference for the Call for EOI's and to the greatest extent possible the selection of the Independent Examiner responding to this call.

It would also be a wise move to consider allowing a better balance between the desirability of a predictable cycle time between Organisational Reviews, and with allowing an interspaced "Internal Review process" interspaced between External Reviews, as well as looking at the benefits of periodic 'Review of Reviews' to be carried out by ATRT's from time to time.

Finally there is a clear need to establish better criteria for timeline measurement relating to Reviews in the longer term to ensure that start times or “convening” of them as well as project milestones are adjusted to be realistic and predictable, so in the case of the the work/project time limitations being set on any given Review Team it should not be measured from a date point until the actual work (first meeting etc.,) happens with that Team, and not at a point when a resolution to form one occurs, or when Membership of it is decided or announced.