

| New Record  |  |
|---|--|
| id  | 1183   |
| Completed   | 2013-05-16 12:18:37  |
| Last page   | 11   |
| Start language  | en   |
| Date started  | 2013-05-16 11:01:41  |
| Date last action  | 2013-05-16 12:18:37  |
| Please tell us about yourself: [Name][ <input type="checkbox"/>   | Maureen Hilyard  |
| Please tell us about yourself: [Email][ <input type="checkbox"/>  | hilyard@oyster.net.ck  |
| Please tell us about yourself: [Affiliation][ <input type="checkbox"/>  | ALS - PICISOC  |
| What region do you live in?   | Asia Pacific   |
| Question 1(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate the level to which the ICANN Board and staff have effectively, transparently, and fully implemented the recommendations of the ATRT1. | 4  |
| Question 1(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe specific recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.  | I am still not too clear on the role of the Board or the relationship between the Board and the GAC.   |
| Question 1(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?  | It is firstly important that recommendations are worded in such a way that they can be measured in the first place.  |
| Question 2(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate to what level the implementation of the ATRT1 recommendations have resulted in the desired improvements in ICANN.                     |  |
| Question 2(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not resulted in improvements.   | I am unsure as to whether the recommendations have resulted in improvements. My relationship with ICANN is still evolving...   |
| Question 2(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?  | It is important that measures on improvements are directed to the target group. Sometimes metrics are applied to groups that are not relevant, which can skew the results. |
| Question 3(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), what is your assessment of how ICANN's Board is   | 3  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| continually assessing and improving its governance as specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1 (a)?  |   |
| Question 3(B): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving Board governance.           | Yes   |
| Question 3(B): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving Board governance. - comment | At ICANN meetings constituencies meet with the Board, and I often wonder at the effectiveness of these meetings.  |
| Question 3(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure whether ICANN's Board is continually assessing and improving its governance?  | What are the benchmarks for assessment and improvement of high level governance responsibilities?   |
| Question 4(A): Are you aware of the process through which ICANN Board Members are nominated/elected?   | Yes   |
| Question 4(B): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate how well the Board follows clear rules and proceedings in its operation and decision-making.   |   |
| Question 4(C): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate whether you believe the Board makes decisions in a transparent way.  |   |
| Question 4(D): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning no idea and 10 meaning full understanding), please indicate your understanding of the Board's rationale for taking decisions and giving advice.  |   |
| Question 4(E): What should the ATRT2 ask the Board specifically to change in the way it normally works?  | I have given no answer to the questions above because although I have an understanding of how the Board is comprised, I know little about their decision making processes |
| Question 4(F): Which metrics would allow you to better follow up the Board's work?   | An easily accessible summary of decisions made by the Board with brief comment on their rationale.  |
| Question 4(G): Do you think Directors should   | Current terms are satisfactory  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| stay for longer/shorter terms?   |  |
| Question 4(G): Do you think Directors should stay for longer/shorter terms? - comment  | Some continuity it important.  |
| Question 4(H): For individual members do you see any source of potential conflict with the rest of the community?  | Yes  |
| Question 4(I): If you answered "yes" to 4(H), on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning completely), please indicate how effective you believe the existing conflict of interest declarations/recusal mechanisms are at preventing actual conflicts.                                |  |
| Question 5(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning none and 10 meaning fully sufficient), please indicate your view of the level in which the Board takes the necessary care and dedicates enough time for discussion relating to GAC advice.   |  |
| Question 5(B): What metrics would be appropriate to measure the level of this care and/or dedication of time?  | I have given "no answers" for the above because I do not understand the current processes well enough to be able to judge their effectiveness. Again it is difficult to measure whether the Board has taken ENOUGH "care and discussion time" over certain issues. |
| Question 6(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate your assessment of the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the Board as specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1(b).  |  |
| Question 6(B): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the Board.           |  |
| Question 6(B): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the Board. - comment | I have not answered questions related to the GAC as I am not a member of this group  |
| Question 6(C): What metrics do you believe   |  |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| would be appropriate to measure GAC effectiveness?  |     |
| Question 7(A): Are you aware how the process under which the GAC members are appointed?   | N/A |
| Question 7(B): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully) please indicate your view of the transparency of GAC decisions.  |     |
| Question 7(C): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate your understanding of the GAC's rationale for taking decisions and giving advice to the Board.  |     |
| Question 7(D): What should the ATRT2 specifically ask the GAC to change in the way they normally work?  |     |
| Question 7(E): What metrics would allow you to better follow up the GAC's work?   |     |
| Question 7(F): For individual GAC members do you see any source of potential conflict with the Board and the rest of the community?   | N/A |
| Question 7(G): If you answered "yes" to 7(F), on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning completely), please indicate how effective you believe the existing mechanisms are at preventing actual conflicts.                               |     |
| Question 8(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate your view of the level to which the GAC has done a good job in terms of checks and balances on the accountability and transparency of ICANN as a whole. |     |
| Question 8(B): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure GAC's performance in this role of providing checks and balances on the accountability and transparency of ICANN as a whole?  |     |
| Question 9(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning unacceptable and 10 meaning fully sufficient), what is your assessment of the processes by which ICANN receives public input and whether ICANN is continually assessing and improving these processes as  | 3   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1 (c)?  |   |
| Question 9(B): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input.           | Yes   |
| Question 9(B): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input. - comment |   |
| Question 10(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning unacceptable, 10 meaning excellent), please indicate how easy it is to put forward new public inputs to ICANN.  | 3   |
| Question 10(B): How easy is it over the course of a year?  | Not easy  |
| Question 10(C): When did you last use the public comment mechanism?  | 3 - 6 months  |
| Question 10(D): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning unacceptable, 10 meaning excellent), how would you rate ICANN staff's work in processing public input transparently and publicizing its possible impact?  | 4   |
| Question 10(E): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning "unacceptable" and 10 meaning "excellent"), please rate ICANN staff in helping the community identify the pros and cons of those inputs in a clear and transparent way?   | 4   |
| Question 10(F): How do you think the overall public input process can be improved?   | The notification process needs to be "fine-tuned". A demand for public comment and a link is hardly an attractive invitation to participate. And the requests come one after the other, in the middle of my day job activities, so that I lose track and sometimes don't respond. |
| Question 11(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning unacceptable and 10 meaning excellent), please rate your view of the sufficiency and transparency of communication between the different SO/ACs   | 3   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| on public inputs.   |   |
| Question 11(B): On a scale of 1 to 10, (1 meaning "acceptable" and 10 meaning "excellent") how would you rate the chances for discussions between the different SO/AC during the public meetings?   | 6   |
| Question 12(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all, 10 meaning fully), please indicate your assessment of the extent to which ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community as specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1(d)?                        | 4   |
| Question 12(B): If applicable, provide specific example(s) when ICANN decisions were or were not embraced, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community?   | My assessment is based more on the awareness of ICANN participants of the decisions that are made, and how these decisions will impact on them. Decisions are often made and then the ideas are SOLD to the members eg the decisions about where the regional hubs were going to be situated. |
| Question 12(C): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the acceptance of ICANN decisions by the public and the Internet community.           | Yes   |
| Question 12(C): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the acceptance of ICANN decisions by the public and the Internet community. - comment | Decisions should be made without the hype and with more explanation of the reasons why (benefits to members) in terms that everyone can understand.   |
| Question 13: As a percentage, please indicate your view of the chances for a revision of Board's decisions since the ATRT1.   | 20.0000000000   |
| Question 14(A): How do you embrace, support or accept the decisions of the ICANN Board, for example, do you embrace the decisions of the Board after an internal review of it in your community and/or working group?   | I am with the ALAC, and as a member of an end-user group my focus is "what value does this ICANN decision give to my membership?"   |
| Question 14(B): Have you asked for a review of Board decision? If "yes", which ones?  | No  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Question 14(B): Have you asked for a review of Board decision? If "yes", which ones? - comment</p>  | <p>I haven't been involved long enough to do this.</p>   |
| <p>Question 15(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please provide your assessment of whether the policy development process in ICANN facilitates enhanced cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development as specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1(e)?</p>                                       | <p>7</p>   |
| <p>Question 15(B): If applicable, identify a specific example(s) when the policy making process in ICANN did or did not facilitate cross-community deliberations or result in effective and timely policy development?</p>   | <p>The process may need refining, but I think that the cross community input is important and ALAC's role is to get the issues out there. Its is just that sometimes there is an overload that is not sustainable if its the same people contributing.</p>           |
| <p>Question 15(C): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the policy development process to facilitate cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development.</p>           | <p>Yes</p>   |
| <p>Question 15(C): Are there issues related to this provision you believe should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2? If you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the policy development process to facilitate cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development. - comment</p> | <p>How do you get more people from across ICANN participating in the feedback process so that policy is relevant to all stakeholder groups. Otherwise what is the purpose of a multistakeholder model that doesn't reflect multistakeholder needs and interests?</p> |
| <p>Question 16(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please provide your assessment of ICANN staff adherence to the policy decisions of the ICANN policy development process in its operational activities.</p>   |  |
| <p>Question 16(B): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate the level to which ICANN staff has been accountable to the ICANN community in its activities.</p>  |  |
| <p>Question 16(C): If applicable, provide</p>  | <p>"No answers" because I have no real knowledge</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| examples of where ICANN staff has restricted its decisionmaking to the boundaries set by the Policy Development Processes or gone beyond those boundaries to either make new policy or replace existing policy without Community development process or consultation?  | of the level of involvement of the ICANN staff in the policy development process   |
| Question 16(D): Are there specific accountability issues the ATRT2 should explore related to ICANN staff's interactions with the Community policy development process? If you answered "yes", provide specific accountability issues the ATRT2 should explore related to ICANN staff's interactions with the Community policy development process.           | Yes  |
| Question 16(D): Are there specific accountability issues the ATRT2 should explore related to ICANN staff's interactions with the Community policy development process? If you answered "yes", provide specific accountability issues the ATRT2 should explore related to ICANN staff's interactions with the Community policy development process. - comment | Probably some understanding of what the specific roles are of staff and community in this process. Who has ultimate responsibility for the result of the process - staff or community? |
| Question 17(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate the level to which the ICANN Board and staff have effectively, transparently, and fully implemented the recommendations of the SSRRT.   |  |
| Question 17(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.   | I apologise that I do not know much about this Review Team   |
| Question 17(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?  |  |
| Question 18(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate the level to which the implementation of the SSRRT recommendations has resulted in the desired improvements in ICANN.   |  |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| Question 18(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not resulted in improvements.   |   |
| Question 18(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?  |   |
| Question 19(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please indicate the level to which the ICANN Board and staff have effectively, transparently, and fully implemented the recommendations of the WHOISRT. |   |
| Question 19(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.   | I am not aware of what has been implemented following this review.  |
| Question 19(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?  | Metrics could measure any changes made to the WhoIS policy? The effectiveness of these changes need to be measured according to a range of deliverables.  |
| Question 20(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully, please indicate the level to which the implementation of the WHOISRT recommendations has resulted in the desired improvements in ICANN.                  |   |
| Question 20(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not resulted in improvements.   | I am not sure how these recommendations have been measured to assess improvement  |
| Question 20(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?  | A list of all expected improvements and a rated assessment of achieve improvement based on a range of variables and actual deliverables.  |
| Question 21(A): How do you evaluate overall accountability and transparency of the ICANN processes?  | On what I know and can understand of ICANN processes and decisions. I think that there are definite improvements in ICANN's direction to communicate with its members and because it is such a large organisation this is difficult, but the communication processes should also be meaningful and relevant to ICANN users. MY ICANN is a good model, but the information is not always relevant. This is perhaps a better way of getting info out to ALAC members in areas |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | that they want to participate in rather than being bombarded with everything - in the interests of accountability and transparency - but sometimes its just too much. |
| Question 21(B): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning none and 10 meaning full), how would you rate the participation of the community in accountability and transparency issues?  | 3   |
| Question 21(C): Are there other issues that should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2 consistent with its mandate? If you answered "yes", please provide specific and detailed descriptions of any such issues along with an explanation as to why such issues should be addressed by the ATRT2.           |   |
| Question 21(C): Are there other issues that should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2 consistent with its mandate? If you answered "yes", please provide specific and detailed descriptions of any such issues along with an explanation as to why such issues should be addressed by the ATRT2. - comment |   |
| Question 22(A): Are there other questions we should be asking consistent with the mandate of the ATRT? If you answered "yes", please provide questions we should be asking consistent with the mandate of the ATRT.   |   |
| Question 22(A): Are there other questions we should be asking consistent with the mandate of the ATRT? If you answered "yes", please provide questions we should be asking consistent with the mandate of the ATRT. - comment   |   |
| Question 22(B): If you recommended questions in 22(A), how would you answer those questions?  |   |
| Question 23(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully), please rate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Affirmation of Commitment review team processes.   |   |
| Question 23(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the Affirmation review team processes have or   | I apologise that I am not aware of the progress of this review team.  |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| have not been effective and efficient.  |     |
| Question 23(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure ATRT effectiveness and/or efficiency?   |     |
| Question 24(A): Have you/your community had sufficient time to review the Affirmation of Commitment Review Team's recommendations and ICANNs implementation of the recommendations? | N/A |
| Question 24(B): If you answered "no" to 24(A), how much time do you believe is necessary?   |     |