New Record	
id	1161
Completed	2013-05-16 08:15:55
Last page	11
Start language	en
Date started	2013-05-16 07:44:37
Date last action	2013-05-16 08:15:55
Please tell us about yourself: [Name][]	Maria Farrell
Please tell us about yourself: [Email][]	maria.farrell@gmail.com
Please tell us about yourself: [Affiliation][]	NCUC
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.	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.	Transparency moves have been minimal, legalistic and purely defensive.
Question 1(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	Timeliness, and creating policies that make full transparency the default, not something to be snipped and hacked at until it is legally sound but in every other way meaningless.
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.	5
Question 2(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not resulted in improvements.	Closed meetings, refusing to share the names of participants or discussion / decision-making at meetings such as TMCH. ICANN is going backwards, not forwards.
Question 2(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	Metrics are a managerial excuse for not doing anything substantive, for simply box-ticking instead of addressing the problem; that transparency is sacrificed for expedience every time ICANN has a tough decision to make.
Question 3(A): On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 meaning not at all and 10 meaning fully),	1

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	External review of the Board.
Question 3(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure whether ICANN's Board is continually assessing and improving its governance?	No 'metric' is needed to simply make it that the Board doesn't get to review itself and then decide what it does and doesn't want to change. That is the fundamental way for the Board's governance to improve; to stop seeing itself as above every other organ of ICANN and submit to external review, just like everyone else.
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.	3
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.	1
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.	2
Question 4(E): What should the ATRT2 ask the Board specifically to change in the way it normally works?	Publish all staff advice to the Board.
Question 4(F): Which metrics would allow	Timely publication of meaningful meeting records.

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.	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?	What a biased question! It is clear that the Board already devotes significant time and attention to GAC advice, appearing to privilege it over other inputs.
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).	1
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	GAC decision-making, timeliness, transparency and openness all need looking at. Also, when other parts of the organisation need to be reasonable and practical in their inputs, why doesn't the GAC? All it seems to do is complain and lob grenades too late in the process, then complain when its diktats

interaction with the Board. - comment	are not obeyed.
Question 6(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure GAC effectiveness?	GAC decision-making, timeliness, transparency and openness all need looking at. A GAC work-flow that acknowledged relevant issues and a timeline for timely and practical responses is essential. Otherwise the GAC will continue to be known for waking up after the process is finished and whining that it wasn't part of it.
Question 7(A): Are you aware how the process under which the GAC members are appointed?	No
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.	2
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.	2
Question 7(D): What should the ATRT2 specifically ask the GAC to change in the way they normally work?	Acknowledgement of issues, timelines for timely responses, commitment and reporting on producing consistent, implementable advice that addresses issues within the purview of the GAC and the legal obligations of its members.
Question 7(E): What metrics would allow you to better follow up the GAC's work?	As I have mentioned, timelines and workplans that have some bearing on the reality of actual ICANN work. This would show basic courtesy and respect for the rest of the stakeholders in the multi-stakeholder model.
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.	1
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	1

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?	The GAC is wholly unable to lecture the rest of ICANN on either accountability or transparency and not remotely in a position to provide 'checks and balances'.
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)?	2
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	Astro-turfing in public comments has never been addressed, barely even acknowledged.
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?	Very 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	5

cons of those inputs in a clear and transparent way?	
Question 10(F): How do you think the overall public input process can be improved?	ICANN staff tries its best to be even-handed, but does not avoid self-dealing and post hoc rationalisation of flawed process decisions. Perhaps having an independent agency assess public comments would help.
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.	2
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?	1
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?	Trademark Clearing House: flawed, secretive process external to the bylaws, based on a biased proposal from a self-selected group. The outcome was roundly denounced by a wide range of stakeholders, could not win GNSO Council majority support and was, nonetheless, implemented by fiat of the staff. For this reason alone, I have chosen not to waste such significant amounts of my limited volunteer time on ICANN in the future.
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	Flawed and biased process of the Trademark Clearing House proposal and implementation. Utterly untransparent and a travesty of the

you answered "yes", please provide specific information and suggestions for improving the acceptance of ICANN decisions by the public and the Internet community. - comment	multistakeholder model.
Question 13: As a percentage, please indicate your view of the chances for a revision of Board's decisions since the ATRT1.	4.0000000000
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 do not "embrace" the decisions of the Board, nor do I convene groups of other people to do so. This question seems nonsensical. Is it a mistake?
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?	Every single substantive issue in the current GNSO structure. A flawed and failed review has meant the structure actively mitigates against cooperation and rewards only those who wish to delay and obstruct.
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.	
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	
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.	2
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.	1
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?	See above my answer on the Trademark Clearing House where the staff actively ignored, subverted and over-rode the majority wishes on a closed issue, creating its own extra-judicial process to force through a policy supported only by a small number of paid lobbyists.
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	Staff interaction and support of business and intellectual property interests needs to be externally reviewed.
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.	
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.	1
Question 19(B): Please provide specific information as to why you believe the recommendations have or have not been effectively, transparently, and fully implemented.	ICANN Board and staff have explicitly chosen to ignore the findings of the WHOISRT and reconvene their own, invitation-only group to deliver a different outcome. I feel sorry for everyone who participated in good faith in the first group.
Question 19(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure effectiveness, transparency, and completeness of recommendation implementation?	A simple yes/no to 'was it implemented?' should cover it. I believe most of the answers would be 'no'.
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	1

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.	Recommendations have largely not been implemented.
Question 20(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure improvements?	A simple yes/no to 'was it implemented?' should cover it. I believe most of the answers would be 'no'.
Question 21(A): How do you evaluate overall accountability and transparency of the ICANN processes?	Does this question mean 'how do you go about evaluating this' or 'do you think accountability and transparency are well managed overall'?. Ambiguous question.
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?	8
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 largely followed the WHOISRT and the response to its findings was a shambles.
Question 23(C): What metrics do you believe would be appropriate to measure ATRT effectiveness and/or efficiency?	A simple yes/no question on whether its recommendations have been adopted, open to consultation with the community to prevent self-dealing.
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), how much time do you believe is necessary?	