

Brief Comment on aspects of the Updated Operating Standards for ICANN Specific Reviews.

Personal Comment - Cheryl Langdon-Orr 20th February, 2019

Via email to Lars Hoffmann lars.hoffmann@icann.org

Firstly let me both thank the MSSI Team for this updated version of the proposed Operating Standards for use in ICANN's Specific Reviews, which I view as an improvement from those initially put out for Comment in 2017.

Secondly please note that like the ALAC and At-Large Community opinion expressed elsewhere, I also am happy to give strong support to this version, subject of course to a review of future edits occurring after this round of Public Comment, and with the hopeful consideration of a few minor points from my perspective highlighted below.

I expect that:

- The final Operating Standards, Guidelines or Standard Operating Procedures for ICANNs Specific Reviews, will be a 'living Document, that in the spirit of continuous improvement and strengthening of ICANNs overall Accountability and Transparency, will be regularly reviewed, analysed and undergo renewal or updated/edited to meet changing circumstances and that such 'update opportunities' could be triggered both periodically, on ICANN Community or Board request, and out of any regular recent experiences of Specific Review Teams. Perhaps as a standard 'Post Review Team' activity.
- Each Specific Review Teams scope should be well defined within the confines of bylaws and review teams should be free to pursue their mandate within that scope, and to best meet the expectations of the ICANN and the wider Community.
- That in the case of 'Removal of a Member', and to ensure 'natural justice', such a process should it be necessary after remediation and mediation efforts have been made and still found lacking that efforts to demonstrate publically impartiality and fairness will be required. This perhaps needs greater input in implementation from the ICANN Ombuds Office to ensure expectations are clear and well managed.
- That in Keeping with the relatively new expectations of Accountability in and between the AC and SOs of ICANN resulting from Work Stream 2 Recommendations, that language in the Final Operating Standards might be strengthened to set an expectation of performance (in terms of attending RT activities calls Meetings eetc..) of the appointed AC and SO representatives, as well as expectations that there will be good and accurate regular reporting and 'Liaison' between the AC/SO representatives and their appointing AC/SO to appraise them of RT activities (unless confidential)
- That an expectation on Review Team Members will be that a degree of public reporting (metrics) will be made on RT activities and as such they will be expected to agree that matters such as attendance records etc., will be included in reports on wikis etc.,
- That the Operating Standards will also include a set of templates relevant to RT activity (SOI Forms, expectations on RT Members, Travel Guidelines, Report forms for use with OEC and Board requirements etc..)

Finally I look forward to being able to assist in any way I can with the future development of Final Operating Standards for ICANN Specific Reviews and any ensuing Implementation work, Audits and Reviews.

Kindest regards,

Cheryl Langdon-Orr