Response to the ICANN Public Comment : Short-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews

Cheryl Langdon-Orr langdonorr@gmail.com

 I have the following preference order for the 3 options offered regarding the commencement of ATRT3. Please record my preferences in the order as A,C then B

Firstly I should, of course, declare a couple of 'interests with regards to Reviews (Specific in this case) in General and ATRT's (ATRT3 in particular...

1. 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 served in the original ATRT and followed closely the activities of the following ATRT2, as well as other Specific Reviews.
2. I have also, amongst others, been endorsed by the ALAC to serve on ATRT3 (as a result of the Call for EOIs back in January 2017) if so selected by the ACSO Chairs in the process now in place since the recent changes to the ICANN Bylaws recommended as a result to the CCWG on ICANN Accountability that I also served on as part of the Leadership Team, as well as in the work of the WS2 CCWG. Like all those of us who have received ALAC endorsement, I have confirmed my interest in serving regardless of when the ATRT3 is convened and seats taken, be that option A, B or C.

 With regards to the section(s) in the Staff Paper that refers to "Lessen the strain on volunteer and ICANN resources"

The ALAC considers, and I wholeheartedly agree, that at any moment the volunteers are putting a lot of resources on various projects.

I make the further points that in my opinion:-

1. There is no assurity that deferring the start of the work will change the availability of volunteer resources.
2. There may be a positive effect from any delayed option choice, upon ICANN staff resources but that should not be a top priority from a Community perspective staff resourcing will need to be balanced and provided to match need as a 'cost of doing [good] business for ICANN' and as such staff resourcing should be appropriately dealt with, regardless of what options are determined and actioned ini terms of Reviews in the short term.

I think it is in keeping with a sentiment I have frequently pointed out in fora where this matter has been discussed, and that is that Volunteers will always have plenty to do, and are especially likely to be running low on energy after major efforts several of which have recently run or are about to be run. BUT that in my detailed and considerable experience it is the Organisational Reviews, not the Specific Reviews and especially the ATRT's that demand the most extensive commitment in terms of widespread Community volunteering, being limited to, in the main, the demands upon the Review Teams themselves. Staff resources are another matter but I strongly

believe that Specific Reviews and ATRT's in particular, are a priority for resource allocation in that they reflect an important Accountability measure and as such should have a high if not essential priority for resource allocation.

Regarding why I have allocated my priority order of choices as I did, I read the Staff paper where it states "...Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018)." as just that an 'estimate' when the staff paper was written (and I would posit a very 'aspirational one at that' so with a PC ending in end July the 'estimate' and aspirations are clearly no longer relevant at all, and the "...as soon as feasible" in my view means any expected (and we have plenty of experience to draw upon in this) ramping up time of weeks or months can be taken into account in the calculations of what is indeed feasible. To that end, even if an A or B choice was made this in all probability might mean the Review Team not being feasible to start its work (on a strict 12 month time limitation) of October or early November 2018 and in fact, running from one ICANN AGM to another might actually have advantages.