New Record	
id	417
Completed	2013-05-10 22:50:36
Last page	11
Start language	en
Date started	2013-05-10 22:17:28
Date last action	2013-05-10 22:50:36
Please tell us about yourself: [Name][]	Alejandro Pisanty
Please tell us about yourself: [Email][]	apisan@unam.mx
Please tell us about yourself: [Affiliation][]	UNAM Mexico & ISOC Mex
What region do you live in?	Other
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.	8
Question 1(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe specific recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.	A large part of the recommendations are superfluous and engender great bureaucracy; they should not be pursued any further.
Question 1(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	A tenth of the existing.
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.	4
Question 2(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not resulted in improvements.	The recommendations to not serve the purpose. They branch out into more and more bureaucratization and miss the point.
Question 2(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	The reduction of the recommendations to about a tenth of the work implied.
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 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	ATRT2 should see how they can make ATRT less burdensome and more substantive.
Question 3(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure whether ICANN's Board is continually assessing and improving its governance?	Annual reports from the governance committee of the Board.
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.	8
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.	8
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.	8
Question 4(E): What should the ATRT2 ask the Board specifically to change in the way it normally works?	ATRT2 should begin to get serious about considering separately the dual role of the Board as a governance component inside the organization and the last-stop policy organ.
Question 4(F): Which metrics would allow you to better follow up the Board's work?	There are too many already and they miss the forest for the trees.
Question 4(G): Do you think Directors should stay for longer/shorter terms?	Current terms are satisfactory
Question 4(G): Do you think Directors should stay for longer/shorter terms? - comment	
Question 4(H): For individual members do you see any source of potential conflict with the rest	Yes

of the community?	
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.	7
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.	10
Question 5(B): What metrics would be appropriate to measure the level of this care and/or dedication of time?	The Board takes too much time considering GAC advice given that it is untimely and ill-formed. NOTE questions 4H and 4I are disconnected; H says conflict with community, I says conflict of interest.
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).	6
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.	Yes
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	ATRT2 should amphasize some serious accountability for the GAC within ICANN.
Question 6(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure GAC effectiveness?	Third-party assessment of the advice, through interviews with the Board, constituency leadership, and community members. Timeliness and clarity of GAC work and advice should be assessed.
Question 7(A): Are you aware how the process under which the GAC members are appointed?	Yes

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.	4
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.	10
Question 7(D): What should the ATRT2 specifically ask the GAC to change in the way they normally work?	Almost everything.
Question 7(E): What metrics would allow you to better follow up the GAC's work?	Public rationales for each member's participation. Far more open sessions.
Question 7(F): For individual GAC members do you see any source of potential conflict with the Board and the rest of the community?	Yes
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.	3
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.	3
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?	Open GAC information and processes will allow to measure this performance. The GAC is barely providing any checks and balances. It is one more loose cannon.
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 specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1 (c)?	9
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	Yes

which ICANN receives public input.	
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	ICANN is providing reasonably, and at great cost, mechanisms for input. Its effectiveness in processing said input needs to be investigated by ATRT2.
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.	10
Question 10(B): How easy is it over the course of a year?	
Question 10(C): When did you last use the public comment mechanism?	0 - 3 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?	6
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?	6
Question 10(F): How do you think the overall public input process can be improved?	Board commitees on each subject attending meetings. Restructure time management at meetings so at least half is back-and-forth discussion among all parties including Board. Some progress made lately.
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 on public inputs.	3
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?	7
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	6

accepted by the public and the Internet community as specified in the Affirmation ¶ 9.1(d)?	
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?	Decisions that reduce chances for domain-name speculation or limit mission creep by the RIRs are regularly circumvented with a variety of cheats. It will get worse with present management.
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	ATRT2 should investigate the effect of groupings such as root-server operators and RIRs refusing to comply and stay within mission. It affects accountability by asymmetry and double-value.
Question 13: As a percentage, please indicate your view of the chances for a revision of Board's decisions since the ATRT1.	60.0000000000
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 accept the decisions of the Board mostly. When I disagree I continue to use institutional mechanisms to try to effect change. This includes review and response in my community or WG.
Question 14(B): Have you asked for a review of Board decision? If "yes", which ones?	No
Question 14(B): Have you asked for a review of Board decision? If "yes", which ones? - comment	
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)?	7
Question 15(B): If applicable, identify a specific example(s) when the policy making process in	Stability, security and resilience of the DNS obtained very poor participation by the

ICANN did or did not facilitate cross-community deliberations or result in effective and timely policy development?	community. Anything more technical does. When the stewardship approach affects interests the cross-community mechanisms are easily abused.
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.	Yes
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	ATRT2 would do well in setting up an investigation of conflict, competence and accountability of community members. ALAC should be one focus point.
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.	6
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.	7
Question 16(C): If applicable, provide 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?	
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	Yes

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. - comment	Litigation-risk assessment. Does it weigh too much? too little? the right amount?
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.	6
Question 17(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.	The Board has gone to a "meta" level that is working too high above ground and too slowly. The consultants hired will take forever and still leave too much work to be done. This is mostly the Board's fault for the way the SOW was constructed, due to risk and work avoidance and lack of sufficient expertise at the Board level.
Question 17(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	Time is of the essence. Implementation time overrules and includes effectiveness, transparency and completeness for these recommendations. Staff organization, structure and results in the SSR area need urgently be re-assessed, esp. as ICANN "goes international" aggressively.
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.	5
Question 18(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not resulted in improvements.	Only timid and tepid adoption for now. The key piece, a risk framework, will not be in place maybe for another year. All is loose cannons in the meantime. Board largely at fault as explained in previous question.
Question 18(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	Scale of community-wide understanding and commitment to SSR recommendations. Staff and Board ditto. Large-scale studies of DNS SSR in detailed dimensions. After-action

	reviews by staff. RSSAC-SSAC coordination.
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.	
Question 19(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	
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.	The issues are too complex. Stakeholders like law enforcement need to improve and make more open and informative their participation. Principled privacy opponents of open whois need to make arguments more clear. An approach that opens up the lens is needed. The work at present is a start in that direction and needs more full-time attention. The "experts group" can benefit from a shake-up.
Question 20(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	
Question 21(A): How do you evaluate overall accountability and transparency of the ICANN processes?	Among the top 3 in the field. Comparison is made to the ITU.
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?	9
Question 21(C): Are there other issues that should be addressed or investigated by the ATRT2 consistent with its mandate? If you	Yes

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	Specific ICANN community actors who can shape decisions by sheer persistence should be made to open up their game. This is more about physiology than about anatomy, ie less about the rules and more about how they are used, abused and twisted.
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.	Yes
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	A Copernican approach should substitute the present Ptolemaic one. Simplicity should cut a lot of coraline efflorescence in the present approach.
Question 22(B): If you recommended questions in 22(A), how would you answer those questions?	Simplicity first. ICANN is complex and ATRT requirements have gone the way of making it far more complex than needed with too little gain for the investment and a huge cost in effectiveness and approachability.
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.	7
Question 23(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the Affirmation review team processes have or have not been effective and efficient.	Lack of simplicity.
Question 23(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure ATRT effectiveness and/or efficiency?	Metrics that reflect a reduction of processes in all commitments of the AoC.
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?	Yes
Question 24(B): If you answered "no" to 24(A),	4 weeks or more

how much time do you believe is necessary?	