

The table below provides a summary of comments and responses made during the [public session](#) “AoC and Organizational Reviews: Supporting ICANN Accountability” on 24 June 2015 during ICANN53. Transcript of this session along with other related documents is available on the [session details page](#).

#	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic	Comment	Initial Response
1	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Mark Mc Fadden, InterConnect Communications	Implementation of Review Recommendations	Are we going to be able to see publicly on the ICANN Web site, those dashboards -- the progress that is reflected in those project management activities?	Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff: Yes
2	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Mark Mc Fadden, InterConnect Communications	Scope of Organizational Reviews	I would like to see the scope of the review being able to be reviewed by the community. Not just the SIC, but actually input from the community on the scope of that review. There needs to be a formal process (such as public comment) in which the community gives input into that scope.	Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: The community was given ample opportunity to provide input into the criteria during the early stages under the review working party. The scope of the review is the structure of the criteria. If we're going to look at -- if something is going to be looked at, it's going to be included in the criteria. And then how that criteria is going to be examined is determined by whether it's going to be included in 360s, it's going to be included in interviews, it's -- where it's going to be included. But the scope of the review includes all the criteria.
				Jen Wolfe, GNSO Review Working Party Chair: We did understand the concern about

				structure. So we did add some questions that allowed for that to be commented upon. So we were able to provide that feedback that we thought should be able to be provided in scope.
3	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Fiona Asonga, Kenyan Exchange Point and a former member of ATRT2, currently with CCWG-Accountability	CCWG-Accountability and Review Process	Staff should engage with CCWG-Accountability relative to reviews. When we create that synergy, we save on time, we save on effort, and we save on the back and forth between the community and staff on the processes.	Denise Michel, ICANN staff: We have a placeholder. And we're very cognizant of the discussions and work that's going on within the accountability framework discussions. And we're keeping very close tabs. And we'll make sure that we incorporate any final outcomes that are relevant to reviews.
4	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Chuck Gomes	General	I really appreciate the fact that staff has decided to relook at the workload and to move some things out a little bit. I think that's critical at this stage and point. I want to reiterate Ray's thanks and compliments of Jen and the job that she has done in leading the review working party.	
5	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Chuck Gomes	GNSO Review: Implementation of recommendations	Emphasized importance of prioritizing recommendations from the GNSO Review - quite a few of the 36 recommendations are going to probably have significant cost implications if they're approved. With regard to implementation, to	Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: In regards to costs, it probably might be worthwhile to take some creative views on that in terms of doing amortization of that effort through uses of smaller projects that can be spread out across time. In regards to

			the extent it's possible, syncing the implementation efforts with the budget Cycle.	syncing through the budget cycle, that's absolutely critical. That's why the only things that should bust through the budget cycle are those immediate things that are either in progress, in which case they should already be budgeted, or those that have to be taken care of immediately. Otherwise, getting it into the strategic plan and getting it into the operating plans, gets it into the budget cycle.
6	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Chuck Gomes	Organizational Review Cycle	Of the five-year review cycle, three years is likely to be spent on conducting the review and implementing improvements. The remaining two years may not be long enough for actual experience from significant changes.	Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: In regards to the cycle, we had five years to work with.
7	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Alan Greenberg	Review Schedule	I'd like to thank the Board for its wisdom In deciding that we have to slow down this process and reconsider it. The original ATRT schedule said -- the AoC said every three years. We took that literally the first time. The first one was done in calendar year 2010. The second was done in calendar year 2013 with only two intermediate years. This time we're implicitly assuming there's three intermediate years. Otherwise we'd	

			be starting another one next January.	
8	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Alan Greenberg	Implementation of Review Recommendations	-Encouraged to hear that there will be more clarity on the implementation -- clarity and detail on implementation of ATRT2. Some of them right now are quite clear. You even referenced this specific recommendation and say what you're doing. Some of them are so opaque that one has to believe that either nothing is going on or you forgot to mention what it is. -If you're expecting groups to prioritize things, they're going to need a lot more information and feedback from staff quickly right at the end of the process when the recommendations are coming together. -I'm pleased to hear that the Board has reviewed the reviews. You might consider talking to the people who are on the review teams, the ones who wrote the recommendations, and seeing whether they think the implementation is going well or not.	
9	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015	Review Schedule	I'd like to echo Alan's thanks to the delay of the review of the ALAC review, because everyone's time	

	Holly Raiche		really has been taken up. At Large Review Working Party is developing criteria and determining areas that need to be addressed during the review.	
10	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Matogoro Jabhera (via remote hub from Tanzania)	General	What is the entry point for a new member who may be interested in joining this initiative?	Denise Michel, ICANN staff: An immediate way to participate is to offer your public comments online in the public comment forum that's open regarding reviews, the scheduled and proposed improvements. If you're interested in participating in one of the upcoming reviews on ICANN's Web site, there will be posted a solicitation for volunteers. So those are the two primary ways that you can be involved. And, of course, as the upcoming reviews go forward, they do a whole series of outreach and engagement and ask for input from the community. So you can be looking for those as well.
11	Matogoro Jabhera (via remote hub from Tanzania)	Implementation of Review Recommendations	I just need to know more detail on that slide number 15. Because I see zero complete, 100% in progress. What does this mean?	
12	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Avri Doria	Review Schedule	One of the things I'd like to caution is putting a dependency on starting the next ATRT on the work going on in the CCWG. The CCWG has yet to propose. The CCWG has yet to deal	

			<p>with the whole issue of how we phase out the AoC and bring in another regime of reviews. At this point we have a commitment to the AoC. At this point we have a recommendation from ATRT2 that the preparation work for the next ATRT, ATRT3 start at least three months before the turn of the year so that the review team actually gets a whole year. So, until such time as things change, I would really recommend that we maintain our commitment under the AoC to start that review on time and recommend, given that the Board did accept, at least in principle, all of the recommendations from ATRT2, that the preparations start in time for those teams to be seated by the beginning of January so that they can actually get going.</p>	
13	<p>AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Avri Doria</p>	<p>Scope of Organizational Reviews</p>	<p>-At some point along the way the SIC decided that no, they would do the term of reference and then, you know, perhaps we could consult on it. But if they said there would be no structural review, that meant there would be no structural review. And it didn't matter what anyone else had to say. I find that</p>	<p>Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: -There was opportunity inside the review working party as it started putting together criteria to do that. Now, the criteria that is laid out is that which is common to all organizations. All organizations have elections. All organizations have some way or form of identifying participants and</p>

			<p>extremely problematic.</p> <p>-In terms of looking at the specificity of the GNSO, when we did this experiment at the last review with this bicameral notion, it was with the explicit understanding that we would review it after we had done it a while. We've done it for a while. So the fact that we were barred from actually doing structural review is really quite problematic.</p> <p>-The Board has to really consider what its proper role in reviewing a bottom-up self organization -- self organizing group is and that certainly determining the conditions of the review is incompatible with that bottom-up organization.</p>	<p>members. All organizations have a responsibility for levels of participation and diversity. Those are all core, if you will, attributes and they all would work well within a bottom-up or a top-down assessment of an organization and they all point to the organizational effectiveness of the organization.</p> <p>-One of the things with regards to structure is that looking at things only from the viewpoint of structure is that you don't necessarily see everything from the other side of how effective some things are. Because it's been clouded by your look at the structure. On the other hand, if you look at things from the viewpoint of organizational effectiveness, one of the things that may be hampering that organizational effectiveness is the structure is standing in the way of it occurring.</p> <p>- In addition, there is nothing that has ever stopped the GNSO at any point in time from undertaking a change to their own structure. So waiting for five years for it to occur is something that you did not have to do.</p> <p>- If in the course of implementing the recommendation to do something you say, the best way to do that is a</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				change of structure, then that is part of the implementation. So you have to take a broader view at the implementation.
14	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Jonathan Zuck	General	I would like to thank the Board for finding money off budget for the CCT review requirements for the survey and the economic study because it was something we needed to get to quickly.	
15	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Jonathan Zuck	Review Team composition	Some of the frustration with the structure actually has to do with how that structure's interpreted by staff. The depth to which you dive into the structure when forming review teams becomes significant. That the fact that there's no one from the IPC that's ever been on a review team, for example, is sort of a function of well, one person from the CSG. So treating them as that aligned I think has been part of the frustration.	
16	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Jonathan Zuck	Implementation of Review Recommendations	Where there barriers to implementation? Was it the amount of time? Why did the ATRT2 team feel the need to bring recommendations from ATRT1 into their recommendations? Or were there other issues with implementation?	Denise Michel, ICANN staff: Part of it was an understanding and the recommendation, different views of what the ultimate objective and what closure meant for each of the recommendations, and so some of the ATRT1 recommendations were, when looked at with fresh eyes by ATRT

				group, they felt that additional work could and should be done and so they brought in some of those recommendations and noted them in ATRT2. One of the changes we're proposing for the review team is to make sure we have some time, after they submit their final recommendation, so we have a much - a clearer understanding and guidance from them on implementation, which should help address that.
17	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Chuck Gomes	Implementation of Review Recommendations	What is the status of incomplete recommendations from ATRT1? The community deserves to know the status.	
18	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Chuck Gomes	General	Has there been consideration of the implications of the CEO being changed in the middle of a review that's going to be started?	Margie Milam, ICANN staff: The AoC says the CEO or its designee, so maybe we look at the designee to have continuity. Ray Plzak, ICANN Board Member: That's why succession planning, which Fadi spent some time discussing yesterday, is so important.
19	AoC & Organizational Reviews Session 24 June 2015 Richard Westlake, Westlake Governance, independent examiner		Our observation is that throughout these reviews the vast majority of the work has to be done by people who are not being paid to do it. The ICANN community is largely consisting of unpaid volunteers.	Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ICANN Board Member, Chair of the Structural Improvements Committee: It is important to get it done right. And the issue of community workload is very high on the Board mind right

	<p>of the current GNSO Review</p>		<p>They have limited time. Our impression is that they have a massive load on them. Recommend that the Board take on board all the comments about the workloads, about the prioritization. We'd encourage both the people who are putting together the terms of reference for those organizations and the organizations themselves to build in time to participate in these reviews. They are an important part of the continuous improvement process for ICANN. Consider for future organizational reviews how to balance the need to get them done with getting them done right, and maybe the timeline should reflect that.</p>	<p>now. It's been discussed a few times. Staff is always ensuring that it is apparent on our agenda, and we ask for feedback from you in terms of the review. We heard quite a bit of feedback and it's all valuable. I'm not sure that we've heard enough on whether or not the schedule is okay. And so for the community representatives, please go back, consult with your community, and give staff input on whether or not the schedule is okay with you. And if it's not okay we need to hear that so that Board decision will reflect the community need and constraints.</p>
--	-----------------------------------	--	--	---