



December 12, 2013

Comments by
The Government of Egypt
On
Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 Draft Recommendations

The Government of Egypt welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Report of Draft Recommendations of Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2. Egypt acknowledges the importance of conducting ICANN's Accountability and Transparency reviews, and recognizes the importance of the issues addressed by their recommendations.

The Government of Egypt also acknowledges ongoing efforts by ICANN to further enhance its accountability and transparency, particularly through implementing ATRT1 recommendations as well as conducting ICANN strategies for the different regions.

Regarding ATRT2 recommendations 1 thru 3, on Board Performance and Work Practices, Egypt believes that the suggested measures, metrics and studies would serve enhancing the Board's work practices and ensure its continuity.

As for recommendation 4, on Policy/Implementation/Executive Function Distinction, despite its importance, the recommendation itself is not clear and is not understood until read in conjunction with the referenced ATRT1 Recommendation 6. Egypt believes that it would be helpful, and would better serve the implementation of the recommendations, if the drafting is made very clear, self-explanatory and independent from past recommendations.

Regarding recommendations 5, 7 & 9, on Decision Making Transparency and Appeals Process, Egypt would like to highlight the great importance it attributes to the principle of transparency, where even an imperfect process would gain the necessary trust and credibility until its further improvement. On exploring mechanisms to improve public comments, Egypt believes that it may be worth a trial for ICANN to consider accepting inputs to PDPs in languages other than English, subject to availability of translation facilities. On another note, with implementation in mind, it is better to be more explicit about expected deliverables. The request to 'explore mechanisms' does not clearly indicate whether the expected deliverable is a list of explored options ordered by preference or goes beyond this to the implementation of the best preference.

Egypt gives special attention to recommendation 6 on GAC Operations and Interaction, and believes that GAC-related recommendations are of utmost importance and include very constructive ideas. Yet a few remarks and suggestions are worth noting here:

- On recommending that the Board should suggest to the GAC that it develops a code of conduct for its members, it is worth stressing here that GAC members are already under their individual governments' code of conduct, which may vary and would override any other general agreements.
- Regarding the high-level meeting, it is suggested that invitations be extended to non-GAC members. It would be also beneficial if surveys or some sort of stock-taking is conducted after each meeting to see what worked well and what didn't. If



feasible, it may be useful to assess the meeting's direct impact, such as new GAC members, new MoUs signed between governments and ICANN, ... etc.; as well as indirect impact such as more regular attendance, more active participation, ...etc.

- GAC Early Engagement, in general, is a critical factor for an efficient and indicative PDP. Mechanisms for GAC early engagement in GNSO PDP is currently being investigated. Two main challenges appear obvious. The first is the frequency of PDPs which may be partially addressed by prioritizing and by GAC early indication whether or not it intends to provide input. The second is the handling of GAC early input particularly at times of conflicting views, where it may be worth trying to go through some mutual consultation period before finally submitting to the board.
- On another note, it may be less sensitive if some less enforcing wording is used rather than "The Board should request the GAC to ...".
- It is also more helpful if complex recommendations (such as 6.6 & 6.10) are further broken down, one option may be by expected deliverables.
- It's also better to use numbered lists rather than bulleted ones (listing under 6.1 & 6.9) for ease of reference, ease of implementation as well as ease of cross checking during later reviews.

Egypt fully supports recommendation 8 on multilingualism, acknowledges ongoing efforts in that respect and stresses the importance of being sensitive to the needs of non-English speaking participants and its expected positive impact on public participation.

With respect to recommendation 10, on cross-community deliberations, Egypt strongly supports this recommendation and cannot stress more its importance to the overall multistakeholder model of ICANN. In that respect, ICANN should work on further enhancing, facilitating and improving its cross-community deliberations to better utilize the multistakeholder nature of the organization and benefit from early cross-constituencies discussions, directly between the relevant SOs/ACs rather than later and through the Board. Having said that, Egypt strongly supports ATRT2 recommendation that ICANN should continue to work on outreaching to under-represented regions and under-represented stakeholders to ensure balanced representation in all stakeholder groups. Egypt would further stress the need for outreaching to the private sector from under-represented regions which are mostly represented by governments. Such countries are not only not benefiting from the multistakeholder nature of the organization but also, being represented only by governments, may think of focusing their participation at other venues where governments are the sole decision maker.

As for recommendation 11, on the AoC Review Process Effectiveness, Egypt believes that it is important that a few members of one review be maintained to serve on the following review team. This seems to ensure continuity of the process without wasting time in understanding previous reviews. It may also be worth considering that the review team continues to follow-up on implementation of its recommendations between any 2 reviews. This may serve to keep track of the timeline, clarify any ambiguity and ensure that the implementation accurately reflects what was intended in the recommendations.

Finally, on Financial Accountability and Transparency, recommendation 12, Egypt believes that in light of the new gTLDs program and its growing budget, financial accountability of ICANN becomes increasingly important and transparency to and inclusion of the community becomes more crucial than ever.



At the end, the Government of Egypt would like to grasp this opportunity to thank ATRT2 members for a substantial, thorough and well-structured report. Furthermore, the Government of Egypt would like to particularly praise ATRT2 draft recommendations summary, which categorizes ATRT2 recommendations and links them to their corresponding ATRT1 recommendations. This was extremely helpful and greatly facilitated the structuring and provisioning of our comments.

Manal Ismail
Egypt GAC Representative
Executive Director, International Technical Coordination
National Telecom Regulatory Authority
Egypt