New Record	
id	1309
Completed	2013-05-17 11:46:18
Last page	11
Start language	en
Date started	2013-05-17 10:59:06
Date last action	2013-05-17 11:46:18
Please tell us about yourself: [Name][]	christopher wilkinson
Please tell us about yourself: [Email][]	mail@christopherwilkinson.eu
Please tell us about yourself: [Affiliation][]	euralo - als ISOC-Wallonia
What region do you live in?	Europe
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.	
Question 1(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe specific recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.	
Question 1(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	
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.	
Question 2(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	
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.	
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	
Question 3(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure whether ICANN's Board is continually assessing and improving its governance?	
Question 4(A): Are you aware of the process through which ICANN Board Members are nominated/elected?	N/A
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?	
Question 4(F): Which metrics would allow you to better follow up the Board's work?	

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 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.	5
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.	3
Question 5(B): What metrics would be appropriate to measure the level of this care and/or dedication of time?	1. GAC meetings should be more open to members of the Board and the community 2. GAC members should assign identifiable delegates to participate in all the other supporting organisations and advisory committees.
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.	
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	
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?	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.	7
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.	8
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?	No
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.	7
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	Not at all sure that the checks and balances are the role of the GAC, which should directly state the public interest to the ICANN community as a whole. Checks and balances are the responsibility of the

accountability and transparency of ICANN as a whole?	Board.
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)?	4
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	The board has to date failed to give a clear lead on: 1. vertical integration and 2. generic TLDs, among other issues.
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.	4
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?	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?	4

Question 10(F): How do you think the overall public input process can be improved?	By taking more notice of it. Input from myself has apparently been ignored. This affects my interest in continuing to participate effectively in the ICANN process.
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?	
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)?	2
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?	Brand TLDs are completely NOT embraced supported and accepted by the public. There is no evidence on the ground of any anticipation of all that. Meanwhile, useful IDN and public service TLDs have been egregiously and unnecessarily delayed by the unsolvable debates over TMCH etc. held in parallel.
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	The new gTLD programme.

Internet community. - comment	
Question 13: As a percentage, please indicate your view of the chances for a revision of Board's decisions since the ATRT1.	50.0000000000
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?	No. The whole process has become so time consuming, requiring expertise on how to manage information in the relevant ICANN webpages, which most people do not have, that there is a strong element of consultation-fatigue. Why bother, when it is (a) so difficult and (b) evidence is that ICANN does not listen.
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)?	2
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?	Did NOT facilitate: New gTLD programme: Vertical Integration; generic TLDs
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	The balance of power between the professional full-time lobbies in certain SOs and the voluntary part time participants in Advisory Committees.

provide specific information and suggestions for improving the policy development process to facilitate cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development. - comment	
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.	7
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?	Not possible to answer without detailed knowledge of the internal ICANN staff processes. Community development process and consultation is heavily biased towards the professional lobbies. It is not clear whether the staff have the ability or the mandate to re-balance the situation.
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	What are the responsibilities of the staff and the Board in the event that the Community policy development process produces inexcusably biased outcomes without reference to the public interest?
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.	Do not know what is the SSRRT.
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.	Do not know what is the SSRRT.
Question 18(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	Do not know what is the SSRRT.
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.	6
Question 19(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.	WHOIS is another black box: a suitable policy was available 10 years ago. There is no evidence of any improvement or willingness by ICANN or certain SOs to endorse a policy.
Question 19(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	Full respect of Privacy Laws in all jurisdictions.
Question 20(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully,	4

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.	
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?	Although the intention is there to create and maintain accountablility and transparency, there is a major problem with the volume, complexity and accessibility of information, and any evidence of feedback as to the results of consultation. In conclusion the ICANN system relies on virtual full-time participation. That is paid for by the lobbies.
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?	2
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.	3
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.	I have not seen information on the ALAC mailing lists about the review team processes. I was prepared to be a member of the ATRT. I am not prepared to spend the time required to try and influence the process virtually.
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?	No
Question 24(B): If you answered "no" to 24(A), how much time do you believe is necessary?	4 weeks or more